DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 624 SP 028 607

AUTHOR	Brooks, Douglas M., Ed.
TITLE	Teacher Induction: A New Beginning. Papers from the National Commission on the Induction Process.
INSTITUTION	Association of Teacher Educators, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	86p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Teacher Educators, Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 ($9.00).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Research Needs; State Programs; Teacher Associations; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS	*Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

The following papers are included in this monograph that provides a synthesis on beginning teacher induction: (1) "Teacher Induction" (Leslie Huling-Austin); (2) "Local Induction Programs" (Ralph Kester and Mary Marockie); (3) "Statewide Teacher Induction Programs" (Parmalee Hawk and Shirley Robards); (4) "The Role of Institutions of Higher Education in Professional Teacher Induction" (John M. Johnston and Richard Kay); (5) "Professional Organizations and Teacher Induction: Initiatives and Positions" (Peggy Ishler and Ralph Kester); and (6) "Teacher Induction: Rationale and Issues" (Sandra Odell). References are included with each paper. Five recommendations for the development of induction programs are offered. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED279624

TEACHER INDUCTION
A NEW BEGINNING

Papers from the National Commission on the Induction Process

Douglas M. Brooks, Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stevenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 607

Association of Teacher Educators

Teacher Induction
A New Beginning

Papers from the National Commission
on the Induction Process

Douglas M. Brooks
Editor

Published by
Association of Teacher Educators

CITE AS:
Brooks, Douglas M. (Ed.) (1987). *Teacher Induction - A New Beginning*. Association of Teacher Educators. Reston, Virginia.

About ATE

The Association of Teacher Educators was founded in 1920. ATE is the only national, individual membership organization devoted solely to the improvement of teacher education for both school-based and campus-based teacher educators. ATE members represent over 650 colleges and universities, 500 major school systems and the majority of the state departments of education. ATE's offices are located in the Washington, D.C. area where it presents its members' interests before governmental agencies and educational organizations. ATE members come from all 50 states and around the world.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 87-070080

The points of view and opinions expressed in these papers are not necessarily those of the Association of Teacher Educators.

Contents

Acknowledgments iv

Preface 1
Douglas M. Brooks

Teacher Induction 3
Leslie Huling-Austin

Local Induction Programs 25
Ralph Kester and Mary Marockie

Statewide Teacher Induction Programs 33
Parmalee Hawk and Shirley Robards

The Role of Institutions of Higher Education in Professional Teacher Induction 45
John M. Johnston and Richard Kay

Professional Organizations and Teacher Induction: Initiatives and Positions 61
Peggy Ishler and Ralph Kester

Teacher Induction: Rationale and Issues 69
Sandra Odell

About the Authors 81

Acknowledgments

We appreciate the contributions and support from the following.

Association of Teacher Educators
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University
East Carolina University
Maryland Association of Teacher Educators
Miami University of Ohio
North Carolina Association of Teacher Educators
University of New Mexico
University of Maryland
University of Tulsa

This publication is available for $9.00 from the Association of Teacher Educators, Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091, U.S.A. (Phone: 703-620-3110).

Recommendations

for the Development of Induction Programs

1. Induction programs are necessary in every school district to assist beginning teachers in making a transition from novice to experienced professional.
2. Induction programs must be based on the needs of the individuals as they adjust to their particular professional context.
3. The experienced professionals who serve as sources of help to beginning teachers should receive training and support to facilitate their assistance including reduced teaching loads.
4. Support personnel should be concerned with the professional development of individual beginning teachers and be separated from the evaluation role of a district.
5. The training of teachers should be recognized as an on-going educational process from pre-service to retirement requiring cooperative financial and programmatic support from all involved including the local district, higher education, and state departments of education.

ATE Induction Commission

Association of Teacher Educators National Commission on the Induction Process 1984-1987

Peggy Ishler, Chair
Douglas Brooks
Parmalee Hawk
Leslie Huling-Austin
John Johnston
Richard Kay
Ralph Kester
Frank Lyman
Mary Marockie
Sandra Odell
Shirley Robards
John Smith
Judy Willard
Robert Houston, Liaison

Editorial Board

Douglas Brooks, Editor
Peggy Ishler
John Johnston
Shirley Robards
John Smith

Preface

Teacher induction holds promise as good medicine for a profession too often fissured at the delicate seam that binds training to practice. This commission brought together excellent people around a topic of critical importance to the teaching profession. Robert Houston had the vision. Leslie Huling-Austin created the moment in Austin, Texas. Peggy Ishler offered her leadership and stewardship. Opportunities were created for professionals to discover each other's commitment and capability. The right players unselfishly stepped forward at critical periods to maintain momentum. The chemistry was exhilarating. There was a moment at the Las Vegas meeting when we all recognized this commission had an important topic, the right players and an outstanding possibility for focusing direction and creating effect. We needed money to realize this product. No commission member even flinched. Around the room you could hear "We'll get it," "I'll try this," "You go there," "We're in!" and "Let's go!". I suggested we try the dice tables, but clearer heads prevailed. This monograph capstones two years of activity with some of the brightest and best professionals in teacher education.

Leslie Huling-Austin provides an opening chapter that skillfully places the topic of teacher induction inside the larger issue of teacher development. Ralph Kester and Mary Marockie report important data and raise questions that should guide the creation, implementation and evaluation of any local induction program. Parmalee Hawk and Shirley Robards report data that should stimulate more active state level commitments to teacher induction. John Johnston and Richard Kay provide important directions to institutions of higher education that have recognized or should recognize teacher induction as a shared responsibility. Peggy Ishler and Ralph Kester provide an excellent synthesis of professional organization activity to stimulate and encourage attention to teacher induction. Sandra Odell provides a closing chapter that skillfully links the rationale for induction programs with the issues to be faced by program developers.

The combined effect of these chapters is a needs-through-systems-to-recommendations synthesis of teacher induction. More will be written beyond this monograph. The authors and commission invite the profession to stand on the shoulders of this work as we

have stood on the shoulders of those whose work preceded ours. Commissions, committees, task forces will come and go. Each member of this commission believes they have made an important contribution to the profession.

Special thanks go to the Association of Teacher Educators for creating the opportunity to work. We acknowledge on a separate page the institutions and organizations that agreed to support this monograph and the people responsible for its conception and development. Thanks to Bill King, Paul McCaslin, John Bowser, Barbara Wheeler, Diana Wisecup, Pam Dean, and Jeff Sabo, all associated with the Miami University Audio Visual Service for their important and creative contributions to layout and production. Special thanks to Allen Berger, Visiting Scholar, Miami University of Ohio and the University of Pittsburgh, for his editorial assistance. He taught me that acknowledgment does not have an e after the g and the implications of that oversight for any manuscript.

Douglas M. Brooks, Editor
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

I

Teacher Induction

Leslie Huling-Austin

Southwest Texas State University

Introduction

To prepare a synthesis on a topic as complex as teacher induction is a difficult task. In a sense, the field of teacher induction is in its infancy so any attempt at presenting "the final word" is clearly premature, to say the least. Therefore, instead of trying to bring closure on this topic, it is hoped that this monograph will stimulate new thinking and action related to teacher induction.

With this goal in mind, I will begin with a reflection on the progress that has been made in this country during the past decade in dealing with the induction of beginning teachers. Included within this summary is a discussion of how this monograph contributes to and promotes the knowledge base related to teacher induction. Secondly, I will examine teacher induction as a part of the larger picture and suggest several critical professional issues that must be addressed if teacher induction programs are to be successful in accomplishing their goals. Thirdly, this section will conclude with a discussion of needed next steps and recommendations for future directions in teacher induction research and practice.

THERE IS REASON TO BE ENCOURAGED

Ten years ago an American educator who was concerned about the induction of beginning teachers would likely have had difficulty finding colleagues with similar interests. A survey of the educational literature in the mid-1970s would have yielded few

articles about the problems of teacher induction and programs to assist beginning teachers. Of those few who were writing about teacher induction, most were from other countries, namely Great Britain and Australia.

Recent Activity in Teacher Induction

Today the situation in American education related to teacher induction, is vastly different than it was prior to the mid-1970s, so much so that there is reason to be encouraged. A survey of the current literature indicates that teacher induction is a topic that is growing in popularity. In fact, several major journals have devoted entire issues to the topic including *Educational Leadership* (November, 1985), *Journal of Teacher Education* (January-February, 1986), *Kappa Delta Pi Record* (July-August, 1986) and *Action in Teacher Education* (Winter, 1987). The ERIC Clearinghouse for Teacher Education (1986) has recently produced three digests related to beginning teachers under the titles of "Components of Induction Programs," "Teacher Mentoring," and "Current Developments of Teacher Induction Programs."

Annual meeting programs of various educational organizations including the Association of Teacher Educators, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, American Educational Research Association, and National Staff Development Council, to name a few, also indicate increasing numbers of sessions devoted to the topic of teacher induction. Several national conferences focusing totally or partially on teacher induction have recently been sponsored by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (R&DCTE) at the University of Texas at Austin and have resulted in publications of conference proceedings (Griffin & Hukill, 1983; Huling-Austin, Putnam, Edwards & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Hord, O'Neal & Smith, 1985). R&DCTE also has for the past two years coordinated a national Teacher Induction Network consisting of persons working in the field of teacher induction from local school districts, colleges and universities, state departments of education, regional educational service agencies and national professional organizations. A network newsletter has also periodically been produced by R&DCTE.

The Association of Teacher Educators launched a three-year National Commission on the Teacher Induction Process to serve from 1985-1988. This body in conjunction with its national and regional meetings has sponsored a series of open hearings and presentations devoted to the discussion of teacher induction issues and is responsible for the production of this monograph. In addition,

the group has worked closely with the national Teacher Induction Network sponsored by R&DCTE and these two groups have jointly produced a national Directory of Teacher Induction Programs (Huling-Austin, ed., 1986).

On the research scene, increasing numbers of studies on beginning teachers and teacher induction programs have been conducted. Major studies include McDonald's (1980) probe of the problems of beginning teachers and induction programs. Another major study, the Teacher Induction Study (Hoffman, Griffin, Edwards, Paulissen, O'Neal & Barnes, 1985; Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen, 1986) was a policy-into-practice study of state-mandated induction programs. More recently, members of the Teacher Induction Network sponsored by R&DCTE conducted a national collaborative study of Teacher Induction in Diverse Contexts in which researchers from 26 sites across the nation collected data in their own settings for a national data base (Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1986).

Finally, the most powerful testimony to support the growing recognition of the importance of teacher induction is the increasing numbers of teacher induction programs being implemented across the country. Educational agencies including local school districts, college and universities, regional educational service agencies and state departments of education are involved in designing and implementing teacher induction programs. Among the programs which have received the most national attention are the California Mentor Teacher Program, Georgia Teacher Certification Program, Florida Beginning Teacher Program, Virginia Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, and the Career Development Program of Charlotte-Mecklenberg, North Carolina.

In summary, compared to one decade ago there is a great amount of interest and activity related to teacher induction. Yet, while there is reason to be encouraged, there is still a tremendous amount to be done and to be learned.

What This Monograph Contributes

This monograph addresses a previously unfilled niche in the teacher induction literature. Most of what has been written or presented either reviews literature on teacher induction or reports the activities of a single induction program. This monograph contributes and promotes the teacher induction knowledge base by providing a global overview of the state of the scene and by providing previously unavailable survey data from state departments of

education (SDEs), institutions of higher education (IHEs), and local education agencies (LEAs). It reflects the purpose and scope of our national commission which is to consider teacher induction in its broadest sense and to promote thinking about and commitment to the field of teacher induction among ATE's national constituency.

Odell provides an insightful overview of the educational rationale underlying teacher induction programs by clearly spelling out the special needs and concerns of beginning teachers and by drawing upon various theories of teacher development which can be used to help address these needs. She concisely enumerates the critical issues involved in providing teacher induction programs and skillfully elaborates on the structural, personnel and pedagogical considerations involved. Odell's section will be useful in and of itself to program developers faced with seeking support for and designing teacher induction programs.

The survey chapters in this monograph provide up-to-date data from a large sample of institutions involved in the enterprise of teacher induction. As each of the three surveys were directed at a different target audience (IHEs, SDEs, LEAs), each contributes unique information about teacher educators and teacher induction practices in those specific settings. For example, Kay and Johnston in their IHE survey of the 700 AACTE institutions not only gathered information about existing and planned programs and common induction activities; they also investigated the formal arrangements IHEs have developed with school districts, how IHEs account for involvement in induction activities in the faculty work load, and how faculty are assigned to work in induction activities.

From SDEs, Hawk and Robards classified states into one of four categories depending upon whether they were (a) implementing, (b) piloting (c) planning induction programs or (d) whether there was no activity occurring related to teacher induction. From those implementing or piloting a program, they then gathered specific information related to legislative mandates, certification/licensure, time required to complete the program, assistance, evaluation criteria and funding. Their large return including 47 states and the District of Columbia undoubtedly makes this survey one of the most comprehensive of its kind.

The LEA survey conducted by Kester and Marockie provides useful information to those frontline teacher educators who work with beginning teachers in their first teaching assignment. Not only have these researchers gathered very specific information

about the kinds of activities involved in induction programs, how much time is devoted to teacher induction, and how programs are evaluated, they also tapped the thinking of practitioners in the field about what factors promote and hinder successful teacher induction.

Collectively, these three surveys provide a comprehensive picture of teacher induction in this country that has not been previously available. Also, each survey individually provides information of unique interest and utility to specific groups of teacher educators. For these reasons these surveys contribute significantly to our understanding of the state of the teacher induction scene at the national level.

Finally, it is the goal of this section to help promote the field of teacher induction in a number of ways. This section is intended to provide a concise overview of the national activities related to teacher induction. It is further hoped that this section will in some small way help shape the future of teacher induction in this country by suggesting needed next steps and recommendations for future directions in teacher induction research and practice.

TEACHER INDUCTION AS A PART OF THE BIGGER PICTURE

Because the phenomenon of teacher induction does not occur in a vacuum, it is necessary to consider teacher induction and programs for beginning teachers in light of the larger picture. Practically speaking, the bottomline purposes of most induction programs are to develop better beginning teachers and to retain those promising beginning teachers who without an induction program might get discouraged and abandon the profession (Huling-Austin, 1986). Although few educators would argue with these purposes, much of what occurs in actual practice is counterproductive to these ends. While all issues and problems facing education ultimately influence the induction of beginning teachers, several are especially influential and will be focused on in this section. Among these issues are the assignment and misassignment of teachers, the retention of teachers in the profession, and working conditions within the profession.

Assignment of Teachers

The problem of teacher misassignment is so great that the Council for Basic Education and the American Federation of Teachers recently conducted a study entitled "Making Do in the

Classroom: A Report on the Misassignment of Teachers." In their study it was found that the widespread practice of out-of-field teaching, though discouraged by law, tacitly takes place in most states. Calling the misassignment of teachers "education's dirty little secret," AFT president Albert Shanker estimated that some 200,000 teachers are teaching subjects they're not certified to teach.

Roth (1986) suggests the problem of misassignment is particularly bad in regard to beginning teachers. He writes, "When new teachers are hired, they are more likely to be placed in assignments for which they are not certified than veteran teachers. Of all newly hired teachers, some 12.4% (26,300) are not certified in the fields to which they are assigned."

The problem of beginning teacher misassignment is further compounded by a number of factors. Generally speaking, the teachers with the most experience request and receive the most attractive asssignments, leaving the more difficult assignments to be assumed by beginning teachers—those with the least background and experience to handle these challenges. Difficult assignments can take several forms besides teaching in an area for which the teacher is not certified, such as working with low-ability or unmotivated/disruptive students, having numerous class preparations, "floating" from classroom to classroom, or being responsible for demanding and time-consuming extracurricular activities. These types of beginning teacher misplacements and overloads have been noted by researchers who conclude that beginning teachers are often put in situations which prevent them from succeeding in their first years of teaching (Huling & Hall, 1984; Hoffman, Griffin, Edwards, Paulissen, O'Neal & Barnes, 1985; Huling-Austin, Putnam & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986).

A related but lesser problem is when beginning teachers are not technically misassigned but are assigned out of their area of expertise. An example of this is reported by Huling-Austin, Putman and Galvez-Hjornevik (1986), who described a first-year teacher certified in language arts but assigned fulltime to teach remedial reading to low-achieving students in the middle school even though she had virtually no background in reading. By comparison to other first-year teachers in her school, this teacher looked weak, although researchers speculated that with a different teaching assignment better matched to her background she would have been considered an average or above average first-year teacher.

Retention of Teachers in the Profession

If a profession is to remain viable and strong, it must be able to

not only attract promising candidates to its ranks; it must also retain significant numbers of its most talented members. The education profession is in jeopardy on both accounts, so much so that many persons are predicting a national teacher shortage of the magnitude we have never seen before. For example, the 1985 edition of *The Condition of Education* indicates that in November 1983 there was a shortage of 3,970 teachers—2,320 elementary and 1,650 secondary teachers. Projections through 1992 suggest a dire situation. The overall supply as a percentage of demand was estimated 102.8% in 1984, and even with this figure, there were severe shortages in certain areas of the country and in certain disciplines such as science and math. However, this percentage is expected to decline steadily through 1992. The projection for 1992 suggests that by then the supply will be only 65.6% of the demand (Gerard, 1985).

The predicted shortage of teachers is both a function of fewer persons entering teacher education programs and larger numbers of teachers abandoning the profession. Research indicates that beginning teachers leave in the largest numbers. Schlecty and Vance (1983) estimate that, nationally, approximately 15% of the new teachers leave after their first year of teaching as compared to the overall teacher turnover rate of 6%. This means that the first year teacher is 2½ times more likely to leave the profession than his or her more experienced counterpart. Schlecty and Vance further point out that approximately 15% of beginning teachers will leave after their second year and that an additional 10% will leave after the third year. The turnover rate of new teachers does not level out to the overall rate of 6% until the fifth or sixth year. Of all beginning teachers who enter the profession, 40 to 50% will leave during the first seven years of their career and in excess of two-thirds of those will do so in the first four years of teaching. These figures are especially depressing in light of evidence that suggests that those teachers who are the most academically talented leave in the greatest numbers (Schlecty and Vance, 1983).

Clearly, without appropriate assistance during the induction period, many potentially good techers become discouraged and abandon their teaching careers (Ryan, Newman, Applegate, Lasley, Flora and Johnston, 1980). Therefore, a necessary first step toward increasing teacher retention is to provide induction programs tailored to meet the specific needs of beginning teachers in their specific setting. When such induction programs become routine practice, we can expect to increase the retention of beginning teachers during the induction years. However, it is unrealistic to

think that induction programs alone will be powerful enough to significantly increase the long-term retention of teachers. There are many factors (conditions in the workplace, teacher salaries, status of the profession, limited opportunities for advancement) that contribute to teachers leaving the profession. Because of some of these factors, some beginning teachers will leave the profession during their first years regardless of what type of induction experiences they are provided. If teacher retention is to be significantly increased, it will be necessary not only to provide appropriate induction experiences for beginning teachers; it will be necessary to address these other factors. A brief discussion of these factors, which are a part of the bigger picture, follows.

Working Conditions

Most induction programs have as a goal to instill professional pride in beginning teachers and to help them feel good about their decision to enter the teaching profession. This goal is almost impossible to achieve if the most experienced members of the profession with whom the beginning teacher is expected to associate are disgruntled, demoralized, and dissatisfied. It is not meant to be suggested here that the entire teaching profession is demoralized and disgruntled; however, a number of conditions in the workplace clearly contribute to an increasing amount of teacher dissatisfaction, so much so that fewer persons are entering the teaching profession and increasing numbers of beginning and veteran teachers are leaving.

Teacher Isolation

Teacher isolation is a major factor that negatively influences both beginning and veteran teachers. Most schools are structured so that teachers spend their entire work day isolated from other teachers. This situation prevents teachers from being able to collaborate with their peers and drastically reduces the possibilities for them to learn from each other. To the beginning teacher, this isolation can be especially detrimental. In most professions new graduates learn a great deal from their more experienced colleagues during their beginning years. In the teaching profession, however, beginners tend to spend their entire work day in isolation from their colleagues. In most professions it is not expected that the novice on the first day of employment will assume the same responsibilities as the 20-year veteran. Yet in education this is precisely the case (Newberry, 1977). It is clear that teacher isolation is one condition within the workplace that is in dire need of being addressed.

Teacher Salary and Status of the Teaching Profession

The issues of teacher salary and the status of the teaching profession are closely linked and both contribute strongly to the difficulties involved in attracting and retaining quality teachers. So intertwined are the problems of salary and status that, in many ways, one is reminded of the question, "Which came first—the chicken, or the egg?" For example, teaching is not viewed as a high status occupation because teachers do not earn high salaries. Because teachers do not earn high salaries, many talented young persons, who otherwise would consider teaching, choose other rewarding career fields. This contributes to the public's view of teaching as a low-status profession and increases the resistence to paying higher teacher salaries. Low salaries combined with lack of public esteem are often enough to encourage talented teachers to leave the profession, further compounding the problem.

Many educators have written on the problem of attracting and retaining a quality teaching force; Schlecty and Vance (1981) truly get to the heart of the matter when they write," . . . the quality of teachers who serve in our schools is at least as much a function of the quality of life teaching affords as it is the function of admission standards and scores on tests." In a later publication (Vance and Schlecty, 1982) they point out:

> It would be tremendously costly, both in dollars and effort, to enhance the status of teaching enough so that this occupation would attract and hold 10% of the upper 50% of all college graduates. And there's the rub. Teaching positions today account for approximately 10% of all college graduates. If policy makers wish to exclude the bottom quarter or the bottom half of college graduates from the talent pool, they must pay the price for attracting the top half. That price is substantially higher than most legislators seem to be willing to acknowledge.

For many reasons the issues of teacher salary and status of the teaching profession are especially pertinent to beginning teachers. First, when beginning teachers start their careers as new college graduates they are in the position to readily compare their entry salaries with those of their college friends and peers entering other professions. Secondly, when they are new to the job and at the bottom of the teacher salary scale it is understandable that they would be re-examining their decision to teach. If during this time they find the job to be particularly difficult and unrewarding as the result of the absence of a proper induction system, they are likely to decide that, in light of the relatively low salary they are earning

and the low regard from the public, a career in teaching is simply not worth it. Finally, beginning teachers will naturally be exposed to the concerns of veteran teachers about status and salary and can readily calculate their own long-range prospects based upon what they hear from their experienced colleagues. Again, all of this is occurring at a time when the novice teacher has relatively little time invested in a teaching career and is typically in a position to leave teaching to pursue other job opportunities, most of which will provide equal or greater status and will pay at least as well as teaching.

Limited Opportunities for Advancement

Another working condition that has a direct influence on beginning and veteran teachers alike is the limited opportunities for advancement in the teaching profession. This problem is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the regular classroom teacher with 20 years experience has basically the same job responsibilities as the first-year novice. As the profession is currently structured, teachers have relatively few opportunities for advancement. Minimal salary increases are available to the teacher who is willing to earn advanced academic credit (either through the university or through some other professional development avenues) and small increases are generally provided to teachers for accumulating years of experience as they move up the salary schedule year by year. However, for the teacher who wishes to achieve a significant increase in income or professional status, it is necessary to leave the classroom and become an administrator.

For beginning teachers, the limited opportunities for advancement in the teaching profession is just one more factor to consider in deciding whether or not to make a long-term commitment to a career in teaching. Undoubtedly, many beginning teachers in making their initial choice to teach will not have considered the limited opportunities for advancement in teaching, but once in the workplace they are sure to become aware of this factor either through their own powers of observation or through their association and discussions with veteran teachers.

Each of these working conditions discussed (teacher isolation, teacher salary, status of the profession, and limited opportunities for advancement) have an influence on both veteran and beginning teachers alike. In combination, these factors are extremely powerful and contribute significantly to the problem of attracting and retaining quality teachers. These factors also have a direct influence on the teacher induction process, and if induction

programs are to achieve their maximum potential, it will be necessary for the profession to come to grips with these problems.

Needed Next Steps and Recommendations for Future Directions

Even with all the problems facing new and experienced teachers, there is reason to be encouraged: during the past decade there has been a tremendous increase in interest and activity related to teacher induction. The field is in its infancy and there is still much to be learned, particularly in regard to issues which have a direct influence on the induction process. It is appropriate now to focus on needed next steps and future directions. Attention will be given to applying what we have already learned, future directions for induction research, and addressing the larger educational issues that influence teacher induction.

Applying What We Have Already Learned

Currently, the induction of beginning teachers would be greatly improved by applying what is already known about their needs and concerns. It is not the purpose here to summarize the body of available information which would be used to improve induction practices; several volumes could easily be devoted to this topic alone. However, a few salient examples would be useful. Let us consider what research tells us about the content appropriate for induction programs.

Johnston and Ryan (1983) identified from their review of the literature four common problems of many new teachers: planning and organization, evaluation of students' work, motivation of students, and adjustment to the teaching environment. Still other areas which have been suggested by research are classroom management and dealing with parents (Barnes & Huling-Austin, 1984). These needs are predictable and should be used to structure the content of induction programs; however, it is difficult to predict the rate and sequence in which the needs emerge. To be effective, therefore, induction programs must remain flexible enough to provide the types of assistance beginning teachers need at the time that they need it (Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Odell, 1986b). Along this same line programs must also be open-ended enough to deal with the specific, idiosyncratic problems and concerns of individuals in the program.

Research also provides much useful information about the role and function of the support teacher (who is also referred to as the

mentor teacher, buddy teacher, helping teacher, or teacher consultant). Many educators have written on this topic (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985; Smith & Huling-Austin, 1985; Galvez-Hjornevik & Smith, 1986; Odell, 1986a), and there is reason to believe that the assignment of an appropriate support teacher may well be the most powerful and cost-effective intervention in an induction program. Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) suggest a number of factors that can greatly contribute to the success of the beginning teacher/support teacher arrangement. These factors include:

a. selecting a highly competent experienced teacher who is willing to serve as a support teacher;
b. both teachers teaching in the same discipline with one or more common preparations;
c. having the teachers' classrooms located in close proximity to each other;
d. having a common planning period;
e. pairing teachers with compatible professional ideologies; and
f. pairing teachers with compatible personalities.

These educational researchers acknowledge that it will not always be possible to employ all these criteria when pairing beginning teachers and support teachers, but whenever these factors can be incorporated when making assignments, success of the arrangement is likely to be facilitated.

The preceding examples suggest that there is much useful information available which, if applied, could substantially improve practice. To put it another way, we know more than we think and there is a great need to take advantage of what has been learned to date through induction research and practice.

Future Directions for Induction Research

To date most of the research on beginning teachers has focused on their needs and concerns (Bolam, Baker, McMahon, Davis & McCabbe, 1977; Grant & Zeichner, 1981; Howey & Bents, 1979; Huling-Austin, Barnes & Smith, 1985; McCaleb, 1984; McDonald, 1980; Newberry, 1977, Ryan, 1970; Tisher, 1978; Zeichner, 1983; Veenman, 1984) or what Griffin (1985) refers to as "the adjustment phenomena," investigations of the degree to which new teachers "fit" into their new role and context. This body of research has significantly advanced our understanding of new teachers and the problems they face in their first years of teaching.

Griffin (1985), in his review of teacher induction research,

provides a lengthy list of stimulating questions which need to be addressed through future teacher induction research and concludes his review with a consideration of several pressing research issues:

1. To what degree do research findings, when used as content for teacher induction programs, accomplish the same pupil outcomes as are reported in the original correlations studies from which they are drawn?
2. Do teacher induction programs contribute to or hinder new teachers' estimations of their own efficacy, and is this perceived sense of efficacy related to effectiveness?
3. To what degree do teacher induction programs serve a "gatekeeping" function, sorting more effective teachers into schools and less effective teachers out of the profession?
4. Are the procedures and practices associated with teacher induction programs as valid and reliable as they are claimed to be?
5. To what degree do current and proposed induction programs align with conceptions of teaching excellence?

The issues presented by Griffin are critical and provide helpful directions for research. Other educators have also suggested critical needs in induction research. McCaleb (1985) points out that relatively few studies have been conducted which investigate the effects of specific induction interventions, and few researchers have attempted to test the cumulative effects of specific induction programs (McCaleb, 1985).

Another critical factor related to induction in need of investigation is the influence of specific contexts in which beginning teachers function. Zeichner (1982) points out that attempts to influence the performance of beginning teachers should recognize the importance of the conditions in the workplace and recommends viewing induction as a reciprocal process between individuals and institutions.

Collectively, these recommendations are extremely valuable to the profession in determining both the direction and focus for future research efforts related to teacher induction. We are now at a point in teacher induction research where we can turn our attention to addressing the key driving question: "What induction practices work best under what conditions?" To answer this extremely complex, multivariate question, it will be necessary to not only investigate the effects of specific induction interventions but also to carefully document the various contexts in which new teachers function as well as their backgrounds and experiences which they bring with them to their teaching positions. By studying the

interaction of these factors, it is conceivable that "if-then principles" could be developed and used to guide practice. An example of such a principle would be something like: "If the context is a middle school setting serving low SES students, and if the beginning teacher has no prior experiences in such a setting, then an appropriate induction intervention would be . . . ." When research has yielded a body of information which can be used to formulate such principles, significant advances can be expected in the art and science of inducting new teachers.

Finally, it is critical that research on induction programs involving multiple factors operating in multiple contexts be conducted from a variety of perspectives, using multiple approaches and methodologies. Griffin (1985) makes this point eloquently. "To understand the interactions around and within complex contexts such as schools, I believe it absolutely necessary that we make much more vigorous use of methodologies that blend and explain, that answer and provide needed detail, and that name and describe. This blend is only possible when complementary although basically different conceptions of scientific inquiry can be used in tandem."

Before concluding this discussion of future directions for teacher induction research, a word of caution is in order. Legislators and other policy-makers are naturally eager to know what benefits they are getting from dollars invested in teacher induction programs. This question should be central to future studies of teacher induction. However, in attempts to answer such questions, let us not provide simplistic answers by resorting to the use of meaningless comparisons or contrived measures. The simple truth of the matter is that the teacher induction process is highly complex, and researchers should avoid pressure to come up with simple, one-line answers or numbers that can be plugged into a mathematical equation to determine cost/benefit ratios.

Addressing The Larger Educational Issues

It is important to reemphasize that, if induction programs are to be effective in achieving their ultimate goals of providing new teachers with successful entry into the profession and increasing the retention of promising beginning teachers, it will be necessary for the profession to address some of the larger issues that greatly influence beginning teachers and teacher induction. Some of these issues are under the direct control or influence of building administrators; others are larger still and require the attention of the entire education community.

Two factors which affect beginning teachers and can be greatly influenced by the building administrator are those of teacher isolation and teacher assignment/misassignment. In regard to teacher isolation, a team-teaching arrangement or a well-structured departmental arrangement where teachers share planning and teaching responsibilities are excellent means of orienting and inducting new teachers. Administrators tend to have the authority to structure teaching assignments in such ways and should consider the benefits of such arrangements for experienced teachers as well as beginning teachers. Principals should also try to provide as many opportunities for teachers to collaborate by arranging joint-planning periods, providing departmental workrooms, structuring on-campus inservice days, etc., as well as encouraging and promoting collegiality among teachers through social activities. The induction program should include opportunities for beginning teachers to meet together regularly for purposes of emotional support and to occasionally meet with veteran teachers to discuss concerns and problems.

Administrators should make every effort to provide beginning teachers with assignments in which they are likely to succeed. Essentially, this means making sure that the beginning teacher has the background and qualifications necessary for the position to be filled. It is foolish to put novice teachers into unusually difficult teaching situations, i.e. those with multiple preparations or classes loaded with unruly, undisciplined, or apathetic students. Principals will have to assign more experienced teachers to the more challenging teaching situations. Such actions may not be popular with experienced teachers, but it makes little sense to force new teachers into such situations. Experienced teachers have more skills necessary to succeed in difficult teaching situations. Along this same line it is also reasonable and fair for teachers who have more difficult teaching assignments to earn more money. For this to occur it will be necessary to implement a differentiated staffing plan.

The problems of teacher salaries and limited opportunity for teachers to advance are ones that the profession itself must tackle by making recommendations to policy-making bodies and funding agencies. If the teaching profession is to attract and retain quality personnel, then salaries must be increased to make the pay more comparable with other careers which require similar degrees and commitment. Salary schedules must also be designed to be fair to teachers at all levels, those just beginning their careers as well as those who have made a career-long investment. In regard to the

problem of limited opportunities for advancement, the profession needs to take the initiative in developing and articulating a well-thought-out plan of differentiated staffing and compensation.

Clearly, the profession must have support from those external to the field for improvements to occur, but it must take the initiative to devise a plan and communicate it along with recommendations about how such a plan might be implemented. The development of such a plan is not a simple undertaking, but we need to do it if we are ever going to come to grips with problems confronting new teachers.

The final issue for discussion here is the status of the profession, which has an effect on beginning teachers because it is a factor that contributes to their decision to abandon the profession in search of higher status and increased public respect. One shouldn't look for simple solutions or "quick fixes" for this complex problem. The issue of status is highly integrated with other issues such as teacher salary, the talent pool entering the profession, the quality of the teaching force, student achievement, school effectiveness, and others. Because of its systemic nature, it will be necessary to address this problem on many fronts by working to improve conditions within the profession while at the same time making a concerted effort to educate the public about the problems facing education as well as the many good things that are occurring in the nation's schools.

One successful way to inform the public was a public information campaign recently conducted by the National Institute of Education/Office of Educational Research and Improvement (NIE/OERI) educational research centers and laboratories that was titled "Education—America's Best Bet." Through this campaign, guest speakers and informative materials were available to organizations interested in learning more about education and the progress being made through educational research. A similar campaign was launched recently by the National Education Association. Campaigns of this nature designed to increase public awareness and support are appropriate undertakings for local, state and national educational organizations and agencies. It is important to acknowledge that public information campaigns alone will not solve the profession's status problems, but they are part of the solution.

In conclusion, the status of the teaching profession undoubtedly will be a critical factor in attracting and retaining a talented teaching force in the immediate years ahead which, in turn, will directly influence the quality of schools. It is imperative that the

profession take immediate steps to improve conditions and earn the public's trust and respect that is needed to ensure the future well-being of our schools and our children.

References

Barnes, S., & Huling-Austin, L. (1984). *Model Teacher Induction Project: Research design for a descriptive study* (Report No. 7200). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Bolam, R., Baker, K., McMahon, A., Davis, J., & McCabbe, C. (1977). *The 1977 National Conference on Teacher Induction.* Bristol, England: University of Bristol, School of Education.

ERIC Digest. (1986). *Components of teacher induction programs.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

ERIC Digest. (1986). *Current developments in teacher induction programs.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

ERIC Digest. (1986). *Teaching mentoring.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). *Teacher Mentors: A review of the literature* (Report No. 7208). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C., & Smith, J. J. (1986). *Selecting and enabling the support teacher* (Report No. 7215). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Gerard, D. E. (1985). *Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, p. 148.

Grant, C., & Zeichner, K. (1981). Inservice support for first-year teachers: The state of the scene. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14*(2), 99-111.

Griffin, G. A. (1985). Teacher induction: Research issues. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36,* 42-46.

Griffin, G. A., & Hukill, H. (1983). *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?* (Report No. 9051). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hoffman, J. V., Griffin, G. A., Edwards, S. A., Paulissen, M. O., O'Neal, S. F., & Barnes, S. (1985). *Teacher induction study: final report of a descriptive study* (Report No. 9063). Austin:

The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., Paulissen, M. O., O'Neal, S. F., & Barnes, S. (1985). A study of state mandated beginning teacher programs and their effects. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 16-21.

Hord, S. M., O'Neal, S. F., & Smith, M. L. (Eds.). (1985). *Beyond the Looking Glass: Papers from a National Symposium on Teacher Education Policies, Practices and Research* (Report No. 7203). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Howey, K. R., & Bents, R. H. (Eds.). (1979). *Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher.* Minneapolis, MN: Midwest Teacher Corps Network.

Huling, L. L., & Hall, G. E. (1982). Factors to be considered in the preparation of secondary teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33* (1).

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (Ed.). (1986). *Directory of teacher induction programs* (Report No. 7216). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education and the ATE Commission on the Teacher Induction Process.

Huling-Austin, L., Barnes, S., & Smith, J. (1985, April). *A research based staff development program for beginning teachers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Huling-Austin, L., & Murphy, S. C. (1986). *Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Huling-Austin, L. & Putman, S., Edwards, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). *MTIP Satellite Conference proceedings* (Report No. 7209). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). *Model Teacher Induction Project study findings.* (Report No. 7212) Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Johnston, J. M., & Ryan, K. (1983). *Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education.* In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), *The education of teachers: A look ahead* (pp. 136-162). New York: Longman.

McCaleb, J. L. (1984). *An investigation of on-the-job performance*

of first year teachers. College Park, MD: University Maryland at College Park, Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

McCaleb, J. L. (1985). *Summary of research on induction.* Paper presented at the Forum of Teacher Education, Virginia Beach, VA.

McDonald, F. (1980). The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training (Vol. 1). *Study of induction programs for beginning teachers.* Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service.

Making Do in the Classroom: A Report on the Misassignment of Teachers. (1985). Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education and the American Federation of Teachers.

Newberry, J. M. (1977, April). *The first year of experience: Influences on beginning teachers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Odell, S. J. (1986a). *Self-Identification of New-Teacher Needs in an Induction Context.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Odell, S. J. (1986b). *Teacher Induction: Rationale and Critical Issues.* ATE Monograph on Teacher Induction.

Roth, R. A. (1986). Emergency certificates, misassignment of teachers, and other "dirty little secrets." *Phi Delta Kappan., 67* (10), 725-727.

Ryan, K. (Ed.). (1970). *Don't smile until Christmas.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, K., Newman, K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lasley, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). *Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers.* New York, NY: Longman.

Schlecty, P., & Vance, V. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63* (2), 106-112.

Schlecty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal, 83* (4), 469-487.

Smith, J. J., & Huling-Austin, L. (1985). *Professional development: experienced teachers assisting first-year teachers* (Report No. 7210). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Tisher, R. (Ed.). (1978). *The induction of beginning teachers in Australia.* Melbourne, Australia: Monash University.

Vance, V., & Schlecty, P. (1982). The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: Policy implications. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64* (1), 22-27.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54* (2), 143-178.

Zeichner, K. (1982, April). *Why bother with induction?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of teaching. In G. Griffin and H. Hukill (Eds.), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?* (Report No. 9051) Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

II

Local Induction Programs

Ralph Kester
Seattle Pacific University
and Mary Marockie
Regional Education Service Agency, Wheeling, WV

Local efforts to plan and institute teacher induction programs have often been spurred by forces external to school systems. Local school districts and state departments of education are pressed by citizens, critics, and educators to develop systematic efforts to ensure that better quality teaching takes place in the nation's classrooms. Improved and appropriate staff development often is in the forefront of these efforts. Induction programs at local district levels are considered by educators as a way to improve the teaching quality.

It is generally not possible within the constraints of undergraduate programs and the limited time allotted for teaching experience at the preservice level to train highly professional teachers of demonstrable competence before the first year of teaching (McDonald, 1980). Therefore, induction is directed to new personnel to help ease the transition from student to teacher. Such programs are systematic in design and focus on the competencies essential to teaching success.

A program for beginning teachers permits local systems to continue a professional sequence and supports the view that professional education should be a continuous process, starting with initial preparation, moving on to induction, and continuing through the teacher's years of service (Feiman-Nemser, 1983).

As induction programs begin to unfold, questions and concerns about training programs have surfaced. Should new teacher programs focus on assistance or evaluation or both? Can both be

accomplished and answer the needs of beginning teachers? Will the program be a deficit or developmental model? A deficit model suggests that new personnel come to a system with a void and that correcting such a void becomes the basis of the induction effort. A developmental model is based on the premise that each professional entering a system has a set of skills and, as a result of an induction program, the skills are extended, modified, and refined to meet the needs of the profession and the uniqueness of the system.

We also need to determine if induction programs are exclusively for those teachers new to the profession and the first year of teaching, or if they should be offered as well to experienced personnel new to the system. If teacher training is a continuous sequence, what collaborative efforts must be built and sustained between and among the local system and teacher preparation institutions?

These questions and issues suggest that the induction process is still in the novice stage in many school systems. Formal induction programs are not initiated on a large scale, and those which are presently in operation are not evaluated to a great extent (Veenman, 1984). Yet policies relating to induction are being formed and implemented, often without the benefit of a knowledge base (Austin, Barnes, & Smith, 1985). For these reasons the ATE Commission on Teacher Induction designed a questionnaire to determine what is happening at the local level.

The Commission surveyed beginning teacher programs in 1,100 local school systems in seventeen states. Responses revealed that 112 of these school districts have some type of induction program. The number of full-time teachers in these districts range from 10 or fewer to more than 4,000. Correspondingly, the number of beginning teachers hired range from one to more than 200. The majority of induction programs surveyed refer to inductees as those who are beginning teachers rather than experienced teachers new to the district. Programs, however, also exist which address the needs of experienced personnel entering as new employees. These experienced teachers not only receive orientation information regarding the system but also are given opportunities to analyze instruction, observe peers, and study current educational research.

Table I provides a summary of types of strategies that local school districts use in induction programs. Special inservice sessions, more frequent evaluations, and use of a peer teacher/assistant far outweigh any of the other strategies reported.

Table 1 — Teacher Induction Strategies

Type	N	Adj. Freq.%/ Total Set of Respondents (112)
Develop special inservice sessions	96	85.7
Conduct more frequent evaluation	95	84.8
Assign buddy teacher	65	58.0
Extend beyond 1st year	13	11.6
Require induction for 2 years	6	5.3
Require induction for 3 years	7	6.2
Contract services with college or consultant	12	10.7
Require as college coursework	7	6.2
Create intern status	5	4.4
Reduce teaching load	2	1.7
Give more planning time	1	0.8
Eliminate extra curricular duties	1	0.8

The remainder of this chapter gives a detailed picture of induction at the local school level.

How much time is spent for induction?

Local induction programs range from a half-day session to a very systematic and goal-oriented plan over a three year period.

What is the intent or purpose of the induction programs?

The purposes of induction are equally diverse and generally fall into three categories:

1. orientation
2. evaluation
3. assistance

Many districts consider orientation to the district and the community to be the primary purpose of induction. Orientation usually entails such aspects as history and philosophy of the district, employment benefits and procedures, school calendar, job description and details such as purchasing school supplies, duplicating, and field trips. Some orientations involve an acquaintance with the community — the history of the community, its customs, values and expectations, and personnel resources to be used in the schools.

Beyond orientation, a second major purpose of induction is to inform and train the inductee in the evaluation process. With the importance of tenure and possible career advancement systems that are part of state or local board policy, an evaluation component may be a vital component of the induction process.

Along with basic orientation and acquainting the inductee with the evaluation system, the induction program generally has some aspect of assistance or professional improvement. This assistance might be for the purpose of collegial encouragement, specific training in discipline procedures, classroom management strategies, or a more long term goal of professional development. At the least the assistance is designed to help the inductee survive the first year. At the most the purpose is to provide a life long continuum of professional growth opportunities that flow and grow from the induction year.

What kinds of activities or materials are used in induction programs?

A one or two hour meeting is one approach to fulfilling induction objectives. Other approaches are workshops, seminars, teaching demonstrations, videotaping and critiquing the inductee's teaching, specific teacher skills training, and tours of the community. The district, school, or teacher's handbook is the most common material used. A loose leaf notebook for compiling written policies, notes, and a portfolio of personal information is evident in some some systems.

Who conducts the orientation for new teachers?

Generally, the principal or someone from the district central office conducts the induction. However, a growing number of districts are identifying teachers or department chairpersons to serve and advise inductees under rubrics such as support teacher, mentor, consultant or cooperating teacher. Other personnel such as the librarian, counselor, psychologist, nurse, business manager, also may be affiliated with the induction process. As a result of state mandated plans, some districts require a specific team of people to be involved in the induction process. Team compositions might be the principal, a support teacher, and a district level instructional coordinator; a classroom teacher, an administrator, and an education professor from a college or university in the area; or a supervisor, department head and principal. Some districts contract part of their induction program to consultants outside the system.

How is the induction program evaluated?

Formal evaluation of induction programs is not widespread and does not appear to be a routine procedure in most districts. However, those programs that use a formal process tend to evaluate in detail the objectives of the program. Generally, the emphasis is on perceptions of how well the program helped the participants during their time of induction. Some districts rely on a staff development team to evaluate the entire program and use the information for continued improvement. In states where the inductee is on probation during a specified length of time the evaluation criterion of the induction program is the receipt by the inductee of full or standard certification. Some districts use tenure as a criterion. The level of satisfaction reported by the inductee or other personnel appears to be the most prevalent indicator of a successful induction effort.

Are the inductees compensated for their time?

Generally, time spent in induction is an expected part of the inductee's responsibility, and no additional compensation is provided. On occasion induction is a part of the union contract. In lieu of a monetary supplement districts may compensate for induction time through extended contracts, inservice credit, free meals during a selected induction activity, release time and reduced teaching loads.

Are induction activities voluntary or mandatory?

In certain school districts induction activities are required. In other districts a combination of mandatory, voluntary and elective activities is offered. Some districts have compulsory programs, but the majority are elective.

Why are induction programs started?

Reasons for the existence of induction programs fall into four general areas:

1. The district has determined the need for and benefit from having new teachers understand a core of information or undergo a standard set of experiences.
2. The program may be a state or district mandate.
3. The program components are interventions to modify the behavior of the inductee.
4. The program is an overt assurance to parents that the novice educator is monitored and assisted.

What kinds of administrative arrangements are there for conducting induction programs?

Types of administrative arrangments for conducting induction programs include those conducted by individual districts for their own purposes, those conducted by an established or less formal consortium of school districts and those conducted by the state, in concert with colleges, school systems and regional education agencies.

What factors facilitate successful induction programs?

The underlying success of induction programs hinges on selective recruitment of new teachers, the new teacher's desire to be an excellent teacher, administrative cooperation, total staff involvement, supportive and trained staff development personnel, a desirable training climate, open communication among all and effective principals.

Program success factors include early involvement with new teachers, compensation for the support staff and small group work arrangements.

Certain factors have proven to be successful in developing induction programs. Those who are beginning an induction process can profit from the factors listed and use the information as the basis for guiding program improvement.

1. Train support personnel in the process of evaluation, observation and clinical supervision.
2. Provide continuous information to the inductees regarding the system, the profession and the teaching process.
3. Provide release time for the inductees to attend induction events.
4. Receive support for the induction program from state and local teacher organization units.
5. Limit beginning teacher case loads for supervisors.
6. Establish continuity between induction and overall staff development programs.
7. Provide information to administrators from teachers who have received induction training.
8. Develop a comprehensive plan for the induction program and process.
9. Obtain financial support and time to implement the program.
10. Coordinate inductees schedules for conferring with peers and supervisors.
11. Build an atmosphere of collegial openness for the inductee to seek assistance.
12. Include induction requirements in the contractual process.

References

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). *Learning to teach*. East Lansing, Michigan. The Institute for Research on Teaching.

Huling-Austin, L., Barnes, S., & Smith, J. (1985, April). *A research-based staff development program for beginning teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). *The teaching internship and teacher induction*. Paper presented at the fifty-second annual convention of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Boston.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54 (2), 143-178.

III

Statewide Teacher Induction Programs

Parmalee P. Hawk
East Carolina University
and Shirley Robards
The University of Tulsa

Introduction

For the last two decades there have been numerous studies concentrating on the plight of first year teachers. These studies have reported that moving from student to teacher is a difficult transition. Though some isolated efforts have been made to ease that transition, it has not been until recently that state legislatures and state education agencies have begun to consider teacher induction programs as a state responsibility. In an effort to assess the status of statewide initiatives toward formal teacher induction programs, data were collected during the winter of 1986. The responses from 50 states and the District of Columbia are summarized in this chapter.

Status of Statewide Teacher Induction Programs

Questionnaires were mailed in October 1985 to the Chief Educational Officer of each state and the District of Columbia. The State Superintendent of Education forwarded the questionnaires to the appropriate person in each State Department of Education (see Appendix A for listing). Of the 50 states responding, 19 reported they had no statewide teacher induction program (STIP) and had no plans for initiating such a program. Fifteen states at the beginning of 1986 had teacher induction programs in the planning

stage, six states were piloting their programs and the District of Columbia and ten states had statewide implementation.

Table 1.
Statewide Activity Regarding Teacher Induction Programs

State	Implementing	Piloting	Planning	No Activity
Alabama				X
Alaska				X
Arizona				X
Arkansas			X	
California			X	
Colorado				X
Connecticut			X	
Delaware				X
District of Columbia	X			
Florida	X			
Georgia	X			
Hawaii				X
Idaho				X
Illinois			X	
Indiana			X	
Iowa				X
Kansas		X		
Kentucky	X			
Louisiana				X
Maine		X		
Maryland			X	
Massachusetts			X	
Michigan				X
Minnesota				X
Mississippi	X			
Missouri	X			
Montana				X
Nebraska			X	
Nevada				X
New Hampshire				X
New Jersey				X
New Mexico			X	
New York			X	
North Carolina	X			
North Dakota			X	
Ohio			X	
Oklahoma	X			
Oregon			X	
Pennsylvania		X		
Rhode Island				X
South Carolina	X			
South Dakota	X			
Tennessee			X	
Texas				X
Utah			X	
Vermont				X
Virginia	X			
Washington		X		
West Virginia		X		
Wisconsin		X		
Wyoming				X

Implemented Statewide Teacher Induction Programs

Within the ten states and the District of Columbia implementing induction programs, beginning teachers and the certificates they initially receive are defined in a variety of ways. From the definition it appears that a beginning teacher is someone who holds a bachelor's degree and has less than one year's teaching experience in that particular state. Since statewide teacher induction programs (STIPs) are based upon demonstrated performance (as defined by each state), experienced teachers moving into most of those states are considered candidates for induction programs.

Reported in Table 2 are various components of the 11 implemented STIPs. Column A shows nine of the STIPs were legislated mandates. The two STIPs not legislated, District of Columbia and Georgia, were developed to comply with their Board of Education policies. Continuing certification or licensure is dependent upon successful completion of STIP in nine of the states (Column B). The minimum amount of time beginning teachers must be in STIP varies from six months to two years and the maximum amount of time teachers have to complete their state's induction program is from one to five years (Column C).

All STIPs contain assistance and evaluation components. Though delivery of support is diverse, the assistance falls into two major categories: (1) direct one-on-one assistance provided by support teams or support individuals and (2) specific staff development designed for and delivered to beginning teachers (Column D). The eight states and District of Columbia that currently have support teams in place have the principal as a team member. Mentor teachers, also referred to as peer, consultant, or support teachers, are a part of the assistance team in these eight states and the District of Columbia. In some states a third support team category is identified as "other teacher educator." This category refers to resource teachers and other central office personnel in local school systems and/or faculty members from institutions of higher education.

Staff development designed specifically for beginning teachers refers to ongoing inservice attended only by teachers involved in induction programs. All STIP guidelines require an orientation for beginning teachers; however, this is not classified in Column D as specific staff development.

All STIPs have evaluation components which include specific criteria and/or behaviors desired and expected of beginning teachers. Many states have developed assessment instruments to measure teacher inductees' levels of performance both during instruc-

Table 2. Components of Implemented Statewide Teacher Induction Programs

State	A		B		C		D				E		F	
	Legislated		Certificate Licensure		Completion time Required		Assistance				Criteria Evaluation		Funding	
							Support Team							
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Min.	Max.	Principal	Teacher	Other Educator	Specific Staff Dev. for B.T.	State used instrument	No instrument	Estimated Cost	State Alotted
District of Columbia	X			X	1 yr.	2 yrs.	X	X			X		$1400	$1400
Florida	X		X		1 yr.	varies	X	X		X	X		NR	$1.70*
Georgia		X	X		1 yr.	3 yrs.	X	X		X	X		NR	$100
Kentucky	X		X		1 yr.	2 yrs.	X	X	X		X		$1700	$1700
Mississippi	X		X		1 yr.	3 yrs.	X	X	X		X		NR	$300
Missouri	X			X						X	X		NR	None
North Carolina	X		X		2 yrs.	5 yrs.	X	X			X		$1400	$100
Oklahoma	X		X		1 yr.	2 yrs.	X	X	X		X		$1400-$1600	$550
South Carolina	X		X		1 yr.	2 yrs.				X	X		$130	$130
South Dakota	X		X		1 yr.	2 yrs.	X	X	X		X		$550	$550
Virginia		X	X		6 mo.	2 yrs.				X	X		NR	$525

*Per full-time equivalent student (staff development funds)

tional time and in non-instructional situations (Column E). Presently, other states that do not have a STIP are in the process of developing teacher assessment instruments (e.g. Alabama, Pennsylvania).

Funding for planning, developing and piloting induction programs has been made available by all states who have STIPs. However, only two of the STIPs appear to receive money for implementation and continued operation at the level of funding projected from piloting data (Column F). As expected, states that have support teams as part of their assistance component report higher estimated cost per beginning teacher than those states with only a staff development component.

Among the eleven units with induction programs the role of higher education institutions varies greatly. For example, in the District of Columbia universities have no designated role; on the other hand, in Virginia nine IHEs receive money from the State Department of Education to coordinate and manage the logistics of induction programs. The other STIPs fall between those two ends of a continuum. Higher education involvement appears to be primarily in areas of providing inservice assistance, training personnel in the use of assessment instruments, and serving on system-wide induction committees. For the most part, IHEs continue to serve, as before, in resource roles. The functions of State Departments of Education (SDE) in STIPs seem to be less diverse than IHE functions. State agency roles are to develop rules, regulations and procedures for induction programs and, where applicable, training programs. State Departments of Education are the regulators charged with monitoring and assessing STIPs.

Because STIPs are in their infancy, research on the effectiveness and benefits of such programs is inconclusive. However, respondents from each STIP did provide information concerning what they perceived to be strengths and weaknesses of their particular program. In all cases, the assistance component of the program was viewed as the major strength. Other strengths reported were increased communications between all levels of professional educators and better defined competencies for which to hold teachers accountable.

All respondents reported the major weakness of STIPs was insufficient funding. Inadequate compensation for large amounts of time required of professionals involved in induction programs also was mentioned by all respondents. Each of the eight states and District of Columbia expressed a need for additional personnel and positions.

A Sample State Program

In the majority of existing STIPs the general configuration of beginning teacher programs are similar to each other. Each state has incorporated its own individual mark on its induction program with most STIP designs having the following components:

1. Teacher induction programs are designed to offer the necessary support and assistance for an individual's professional growth during the induction period.
2. A support team composed of a mentor teacher and the inductee's principal observes, assists, and evaluates the novice teacher.
3. Classroom observation instruments are used to evaluate each inductee's classroom instruction.
4. Portfolios containing classroom observation data, professional development plans, and evaluations based upon demonstrated performance are maintained for or by each teacher inductee.
5. Upon completion of the STIP the inductee is recommended for continuing certification.

One of the major differences in STIPs is the amount of preparation and training provided to beginning teachers and support team members. One state, North Carolina, provides a 30-hour training program in effective teaching practices to orient their teachers and team members to the items on the state's evaluation instrument. In addition, team members participate in 24 hours of training in the use of the state teacher appraisal instrument and 30 hours training in monitoring techniques. All states provide orientation and training for inductees and support team members; however, few as formalized or extensive as North Carolina.

Statewide Induction Programs Being Piloted

Presently, there are six states piloting STIPs. Table 3 shows the various components of those beginning teacher programs that are in the pilot stage with Column G reporting the projected dates for statewide implementation.

The major components of induction programs being piloted are much the same as those components already implemented in eight states and the District of Columbia. There is, however, one notable exception. All implementing states use a statewide observation and assessment instrument with only two of the piloting states reporting such instruments.

Table 3. Components of Statewide Teacher Induction Programs Presently Being Piloted

State	A		B		C		D				E		F		G
	Legislated		Certificate Licensure		Completion time Required		Assistance				Criteria Evaluation		Funding		
							Support Team			Specific Staff Dev. for B.T.					
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Min.	Max.	Principal	Teacher	Other Educator		State used instrument	No instrument	Estimated Cost	State Allotment	Projected Date for Statewide Implemt.
Kansas	X		X		1 yr.	1 yr.	X	X	X		X		$2000	$2000	1989
Maine	X		X		2 yrs.	2 yrs.	X	X				X	NA	NA	1988
Pennsylvania		X	X		1 yr.	1 yr.		X				X	$500-$1000	None	1987
Washington	X		X		1 yr.	no max.		X		X			$1600	1.5 million*	NA
West Virginia		X		X	3 yrs.	3 yrs.		X				X	NA	NA	1988
Wisconsin		X	X		1 yr.	2 yrs.	X	X	X		X		$2600	NA	1988

*Total funds allocated for project

Certification

Teacher induction programs have changed the who and how of continuing certification. In six of the STIPs recommendations for continuing certification (Table 2, Column B) are made by local school system superintendents after beginning teachers successfully complete the states' induction program. In Oklahoma, recommendations for continuing certification are made by a system-wide committee composed of the entry-year teacher, the support teacher, a principal, and an IHE teacher educator. Continuing certification for beginning teachers in these seven states is dependent upon adequate or better teaching performance in the classroom.

Summary

Statewide teacher induction programs are either implemented or being piloted in 35% of the states in this country. Most respondents to the questionnaire believed the major road block to implementation of their STIP is inadequate funding. However, all respondents reported the greatest strength of STIPs is the assistance component. This assistance seems to be helping novice teachers have a smoother transition into teaching. From the activity reported during the study, it appears that Statewide Teacher Induction Programs will be more mature and prevalent by 1990. They will be helping to bridge the gap from education student to classroom teacher.

Appendix A

State Teacher Induction Questionnaire Respondents

Alabama	Jayne A. Meyer, Coordinator Teacher Education, 347 State Office Building, Montgomery, 36130
Alaska	Steve Hogue, State Department of Education, Juneau, 99811
Arizona	State Department of Education, Phoenix, 85007
Arkansas	Roy Wood, Teacher Certification, Arch Ford Bldg., Little Rock, 72207
California	State Department of Education, Sacramento, 95814
Colorado	Calvin Frazier, State Department of Education, Denver, 80204
Connecticut	Marjorie Bradley, Coordinator, Professional Development, State Department of Education, 165 Capitol Ave., Hartford, 06106
Delaware	William W. Barkley, Department of Public Instruction, P.O. Box 2402, Dover, 19901
District of Columbia	Joan W. Brown, D.C. Public Schools, 415 12th Street, N.W., Room 804, Washington, D.C. 20004
Florida	James Parris, Office of Teacher Education, Certification and Staff Development, Department of Education, Tallahassee, 32301
Georgia	Sidney Neville, 1854 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, 30334
Hawaii	Mary Tanoieye, P.O. Box 2360, Honolulu, 96804
Idaho	Darrell Lousle, Idaho State Department, Boise, 83720
Illinois	Susan Bentz, Assistant Superintendent, State Board of Education, 100 N. First St., Springfield, 62777
Indiana	Sue A. Drews, Associate Director, Teacher Quality, Room 229 State House, Indianapolis, 46204

Iowa	Robert Benton, State Department of Education, Des Moines, 50319
Kansas	Kathy Boyer, Kansas Department of Education, 120 E. 10th St., Topeka, 66612
Kentucky	Dorothy Archer, Department of Education, Teacher Testing/Internship Program, Frankfort, 40601
Louisiana	Robert Crew, Bureau of Higher Education and Teacher Certification, P.O. Box 44064, Baton Rouge, 70804
Maine	Edwin Kastuck, Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services, State House Station #23, Augusta, 04333
Maryland	Louise Tanney, Maryland State Department of Education, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, 21201
Massachusetts	T.P. O'Conner, Director of Certification, 1485 Hauccale St., Quincey, 02169
Michigan	Robert Trezise, Box 30008, Lansing, 48875
Minnesota	Will Antell, Director of Planning and Research, 550 Cedar, St. Paul, 55101
Mississippi	State Department of Education, Jackson, 39205
Missouri	Janet Nazen, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, 65101
Montana	John R. Voorhis, Teacher Education Office of Public Instruction, State Capitol, Helena, 59620
Nebraska	Gerald Sughroue, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, 68509
Nevada	Carolyn Simpson, Capital Complex, Carson City, 89710
New Hampshire	George H. Lewis, Supervisor, New Hampshire Department of Education, Office of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 101 Pleasant St., Concord, 03301
New Jersey	Celeste M. Rorro, Director of Teacher Certification, N.J.D.E., Quakerbridge Rd., Trenton, 08625
New Mexico	Marilyn Scargall, State Department of Education, Sante Fe, 87503
New York	Vincent Gazzetta, State Education Department, Albany, 12230
North Carolina	Ione Perry, Division of Program Approval, SDPI, Raleigh, 27603

North Dakota	Ordean Lindermann, State Department, Bismark, 58505
Ohio	Franklin Walter, Superintendent of Public Instruction, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus, 43221
Oklahoma	John Folks, Superintendent, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, 73105
Oregon	State Department of Education, Salem, 97310
Pennsylvania	John Rebert, Department of Education, 333 Market St., Harrisburg, 17126
Rhode Island	David R. Roy, Department of Education, 22 Hayer Street, Providence, 02908
South Carolina	Dianne H. Worthy, 1002 Rutledge Building, Columbia, 29210
South Dakota	James Hansen, State Superintendent, 700 North Ill., Pierre, 57501
Tennessee	Jane Williams, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, Room 125, Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, 37219-5338
Texas	Edward Vodicka, 1701 N. Congress, Austin, 78701
Utah	Vere McHenry, 250 E. 500 South, Salt Lake City, 84107
Vermont	Stephen Kangan, Commissioner, Montpelier, 05602
Virginia	James Patton, P.O. Box 60, Virginia Department of Education, Richmond, 23216
Washington	A.L. Langland, State Education Agency, Olympia, 98504
West Virginia	James Lewellen, B-304, Bldg. 6, Capitol Complex, Charleston, 25305
Wisconsin	Herbert Grover, State Department of Education, Madison, 53707
Wyoming	Lydall Hartley, Hatheway Bldg., Cheyenne, 82002

IV

The Role of Institutions of Higher Education in Professional Teacher Induction

John M. Johnston
Memphis State University
and Richard Kay
Brigham Young University

Institutions of higher education and their teacher education units share an important responsibility for the professional induction of beginning teachers. This responsibility is shared with experienced teachers, school building administrators, school district administrators, school boards, state departments of education, teacher organizations and local communities. The proper role of institutions of higher education in teacher induction efforts, like the roles of all these groups, should be linked to the goals of induction programs.

Our purpose here is to consider the roles to be played by institutions of higher education (IHE) in the professional induction of beginning teachers. Five goals of teacher induction programs are presented as a context for IHE participation in teacher induction efforts. Selected factors affecting optimal IHE involvement are discussed. The results of a survey of IHE teacher induction activities are presented along with implications. The chapter concludes with suggested areas for IHE involvement in beginning teacher induction.

Goals of Teacher Induction

Recent attention to teacher induction has encouraged consideration of realistic and appropriate goals (Fox & Singletary, 1986;

Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes & Paulissen, 1986; Huling-Austin, 1986; Johnston, 1985; McDonald, 1980; Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986; Zeichner, 1983). Goal specification is a necessary first step in determining how institutions of higher education might be most usefully involved in the teacher induction process. Five broad goals of teacher induction programs can be identified: (a) orientation, (b) psychological support, (c) acquisition and refinement of teaching skills, (d) retention, and (e) evaluation.

Orientation

A perennial goal of beginning teacher induction programs is to integrate the beginning teacher into the professional and social fabric of the school, school district and neighborhood community which the school serves. Efforts are made to orient the beginning teacher to the culture of the workplace and to ease adaptation to the social system of the school. Beginning teachers—and as Odell (1986) reports, experienced teachers new to the school—need assistance in learning the rules, procedures and standards of their new workplace. Similarly, Odell (1986) notes that first-year teachers and other teachers new to the school system need information related to guidelines and expectations of the school district. Orientation goals are also established to help new teachers learn the informal lore and customs of the building and school system in which they will begin their professional careers. Orientation of new teachers to the school neighborhood is also an important goal. Beginning teachers need to understand community attitudes and values about schooling, and they need both professional and personal knowledge of community resources and services.

Psychological support

The effects on beginning teachers of isolation, self-doubt, stress and anxiety has been a consistent and long-standing concern (Jersild, 1966; Lortie, 1966; Odell, 1986; Ryan, 1970; Ryan, Newman, Mager, Applegate, Lasley, Flora & Johnston, 1980). An important induction program goal is to promote beginning teachers' professional self-esteem and sense of professional well-being. Research evidence also argues strongly for the goal of supporting the personal well-being of beginning teachers (Johnston, 1985; Zeichner, 1983).

Acquisition and refinement of teaching skills

Goals in this category receive the lion's share of attention and resources in most induction programs (cf., Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986). These goals attend to general as well as site-specific teaching

skills, knowledge and attitudes. Effort is made to provide an orderly and personalized transition from the preservice program to the world of teaching. For example, most beginning teachers complete a preservice reading methods course. They may, however, require additional training in the use of the specific reading curriculum and materials used by their new school. Other, more general goals deal with helping teachers identify and solve teaching problems, strengthen skills necessary to reflect upon and analyze their own teaching, and to expand their repertoire of instructional strategies.

Retention

Perhaps the most central goal of induction programs is to increase the likelihood that competent, promising beginning teachers will continue in the teaching profession. Because 40 to 50% of all beginning teachers who enter the profession will leave during the first seven years of teaching (Huling-Austin, 1986), such a goal seems well-justified, particularly in light of findings suggesting that the most academically able teachers leave in the greatest numbers (Schlechty & Vance, 1983).

Assessment and evaluation

One of the most hotly debated goals of beginning teacher induction pertains to assessment and evaluation of new teachers within the context of an induction program. State-mandated induction programs often prescribe procedures to screen out those new teachers who fail to demonstrate minimal competence. Some argue that such a goal is in conflict with the purpose of induction and assert that evaluation procedures should be separate from induction efforts. Huling-Austin (1986) notes that without clearly specified policies and procedures which conform to due process requirements, it will be difficult for an induction program to accomplish the goal of screening out potentially weak teachers.

Factors Affecting Institutions of Higher Education Involvement in Teacher Induction

While the goals of beginning teacher induction programs are a primary consideration in determining involvement of higher education faculty, a number of other matters also require attention. With the exception of newly mandated state induction programs such as in Oklahoma, it is generally assumed that there is little contact between beginning teachers and the institution where they received their preservice training (Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark & Nash, 1976). It is also assumed that teacher education institutions

should extend their formal contact with beginning teachers through their initial years of teaching. Though prescriptions for the nature of such contact are often vague, it is usually understood that college professors will have some form of personal contact with beginning teachers, often stated in terms of "going out into the field."

Such prescriptions ignore the obvious reality that institutions of higher education and their schools, colleges and departments of education are outside the institutional structure of schools. The effect of this reality is that teacher educators have little input on the forms of institutional control which serve to socialize beginning teachers. Unlike the direct or personal control exercised by the school principal or department head who supervises and monitors teachers' compliance with school rules and procedures, teacher educators have no such authority. Similarly, teacher educators are not a part of the social structure and social relationships embedded in the beginning teacher's workplace. Finally, teacher educators have no technical control over beginning teachers; they have no say in what or how teachers are expected to teach or in the evaluation of the extent to which these expectations are met. Such control, Zeichner (1983) effectively argues, may be a particularly potent form of influence on the socialization of beginning teachers. IHE faculty may be swimming upstream in their field-based efforts to socialize beginning teachers.

In order to optimize the effect of their involvement in teacher induction programs, IHE faculty need to carefully consider what goals they can most likely accomplish and how their involvement can be most efficient. This is particularly important in light of the current trend toward greater IHE faculty involvement in teacher induction programs. At issue here is how work loads will be determined for faculty assigned to induction programs. Greater IHE involvement represents an increase in a relatively labor-intensive form of teaching. Recent experience suggests that a clinical teaching model may be necessary. Adopting such a model requires the support of the university administration in the form of financial resources, teaching load computation, and evaluation of faculty productivity.

Failure to obtain administrative support may cause problems for higher education faculty who are expected to work in teacher induction programs or activities within public schools. Teacher educators, like other university faculty, are expected to offer instruction as part of their work responsibility. In addition, they are expected to engage in scholarship and service to their profession.

They are held accountable for each of these three activities in annual evaluations which affect their salary, rank and tenure. Currently, many teacher education faculty find themselves facing higher standards of performance in the area of scholarship, with no corresponding consideration for work requirements in the other two areas. IHE faculty who work in field-based teacher induction programs may be at a considerable disadvantage with respect to evaluation of their job performance, unless institutional accommodations are made to compensate for the nature of field-based teaching and service. Otherwise, the stress resulting from such a disadvantage may produce frequent turnover of faculty involved in induction activities.

A related issue concerns the level at which IHE faculty are involved in teacher induction programs. One position is that higher education faculty ought to observe and work directly with individual beginning teachers. If teacher educators are expected to provide assistance with problems specific to a given beginning teacher's work situation, such direct involvement is necessary. As noted, institutions of higher education would need to make modifications to accommodate this form of involvement. To cloud the issue, there is concern about the potency and effectiveness of this form of assistance by university personnel (Zeichner, 1983; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981.

An alternative position is that higher education faculty could have optimal effect by concentrating their involvement at a level once removed from one-to-one assistance in beginning teachers' & classrooms. Recognizing that beginning teachers need individualized assistance, higher education faculty might be most effectively employed in the training and preparation of those individuals who actually do provide the one-to-one help to the beginner. Given the trend in many induction programs to use mentor teachers (Johnston & James, 1986), higher education faculty might make best use of their time by cooperatively planning and implementing with local school systems a program to train, monitor and evaluate mentor teachers. Instead of a one-to-one teaching model, higher education faculty would be employing the one-to-many model which is consistent with the current organizational and administrative structure of colleges and universities.

IHE Involvement in Teacher Induction

Given the almost total lack of information regarding current IHE involvement in beginning teacher induction programs, the Association of Teacher Educators National Commission on the

Induction Process conducted a survey designed to identify institutions and gather data regarding the nature of their involvement. Since the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education member institutions prepare approximately 95% of all teachers certified in the United States annually, the total AACTE membership (N=716) comprised the sample population for the survey. Responses were obtained from 300 (42%) AACTE member institutions representing Washington, D.C., Puerto Rico, and all states except Maine, North Dakota, and Vermont. Public and private institutions were represented, as were small colleges, universities and large land-grant institutions. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) contained eight questions designed to address several key issues.

School, college or department of education (SCDE) programs or activities designed to assist beginning teachers

Responses to this item indicated that 55 (18%) institutions are presently in the planning stage, 63 (21%) have already implemented such programs or activities, and 27 (9%) are in the process of piloting new programs. Specific comments concerning the status of these programs were limited and provided little information beyond a frequency count. Of those institutions that did comment, 16 stated that their programs had been developed in response to mandates from the State Departments of Education and were controlled to some extent by the State. Four institutions reported that programs in their states seem to be under the control of local school districts. Funding requests had been submitted by nine institutions who were awaiting approval to proceed with implementation of their programs. From the number of institutions reporting ongoing programs, it is apparent that induction is an emerging concern but still quite young in its development. The remaining 155 (52%) institutions reported that they did not have a program in existence, and thus responded to question 2.

SCDE plans to initiate activities in the next two years

Of the 155 institutions responding **no** to question 1, 71 (46%) indicated they did have plans for beginning an induction program within the next two years. Seven institutions volunteered information about the nature of and moving forces behind their plans. Two institutions reported that their plans were contingent on a pending state mandate. A third stated that their plans were to make such induction activities available for any teachers interested in receiving help but that participation would be strictly voluntary. If the responses from the 71 institutions responding to this question are

at all representative of the trends in the profession, it does not appear as though induction is currently a major priority to the main body of teacher education institutions. Given the trend toward increased induction activities in school systems, and the legislative mandates in many states, this priority may change dramatically over the next few years.

Common beginning teacher induction activities

The total number of institutions reporting involvement in each activity is indicated in Table 1. No attempt was made to assess the relative effectiveness of the activities at this time. The intent of this item was to obtain a frequency count of the number of institutions involved in each type of activity.

Table 1

114	Consulting with others about professional development activities for beginning teachers
99	Serving as a member of beginning teacher support teams
97	Conducting workshops targeted for beginning teachers
82	Internship/MAT/Alternative certification programs
81	Field supervision of beginning teachers
78	Training of local education district personnel to assist beginning teachers
62	Offering courses primarily designed for beginning teachers

Diverse approaches to induction

Respondents were requested to indicate beginning teacher support activities in which their SCDE was participating other than the examples given in Table 1. The number of institutions indicating involvement in these activities suggests a good deal of variety in the way in which induction is handled by responding institutions. These additional activities and the number of reporting institutions are listed in Table 2.

It is somewhat surprising that only five institutions reported using "mentors." The literature and activities at various professional association meetings suggest that mentoring is in the mainstream of induction activities. Perhaps many of the institutions responding to the items in question 3 included mentoring under one of those items. It may be, for example, that IHE members of beginning teacher support teams, or those who engage in field

supervision of beginning teachers, consider themselves in a "mentor" role.

Table 2

9	Seminars and informal gatherings for beginning teachers to get together and discuss with colleagues and peers
7	Alternative provisional certificate
6	Trained peer teachers to work with beginning teachers
5	Mentor teachers
4	Computer-based network and toll-free telephone assistance
3	Paid substitutes for beginning teachers while observing other teachers
2	Retired educators as support systems for beginning teachers

Faculty involved in induction activities other than SCDE faculty

In response to this item, 81 (39%) institutions indicated that additional faculty outside their institutions were involved in induction activities; 127 (61%) indicated no additional faculty involvement. These numbers are a little confusing in that only 145 institutions indicated that they currently had an induction program in the planning stage, in the pilot stage, or implemented. It may be that some institutions indicating that they had no induction program also checked the question regarding faculty involvement other than SCDE faculty.

The other than SCDE faculty involved in induction activities include supervisors from content areas within the university, public school personnel from the same school where the first year teacher was employed, district level content area supervisors, and other selected faculty from the public schools.

Formal agreements for induction with local school systems

Sixty-nine (31%) institutions indicated the existence of such an agreement and 118 (54%) said they had no such agreement. Nineteen (9%) did indicate that a formal agreement did exist between their institutions and the State Department of Education. Another 14 institutions indicated an agreement with area schools including more than just one district.

Accounting for induction activities in faculty work load

The most commonly reported method for assigning work load was on an overload basis (43 institutions) followed closely by reduction of load in other areas (37 institutions). Extra pay was reported by 13 institutions and 6 institutions indicated that full-time faculty positions had been created to handle the induction activities. No mention was made by the institutions indicating overload assignments as to whether or not the overload was accompanied by extra compensation. The assumption made in preparing this report was that no extra compensation was given by these institutions. If this assumption is correct, great difficulty in sustaining this effort over a long term would be predicted.

Faculty participation in induction activities

The most common basis for assigning faculty was on a voluntary basis by those interested. This does tend to soften the concern stemming from overload assignments but only for awhile. If induction programs are going to be effective, they must be self-sustaining and not totally dependent on the professional commitment of a few. The second most common method for making induction assignments was according to competence and ability. Ideally, it would be the most competent and capable who would volunteer; however, this may or may not be a reality. Other methods include assignment on the basis of teaching area and area where the demands by beginning teachers are the greatest. The basis for assigning faculty appears to be flexible and based in part on the needs of the local programs.

Given the limitations inherent in survey research, the following picture emerges regarding IHE involvement in teacher induction programs. About half of the responding institutions of higher education are currently planning, piloting or engaged in induction activities. An additional 24% plan to initiate such activities in the next two years. The nature of IHE-induction activities reported suggests that IHE faculty most frequently play a consulting role, although they also frequently engage in one-to-one service as members of beginning teacher support teams or field supervisors of beginning teachers. Less frequently, IHE faculty engage in one-to-many group activities such as training of local education district personnel, assisting beginning teachers, or offering courses or workshops for beginning teachers. Almost 40% of IHE involve faculty outside the school, college or department of education. Although further analysis is necessary, it is likely that a good number of these institutions are liberal arts institutions which rely

on content area faculty to support the teacher education activities. It appears that when institutions engage in teacher induction activities, they do so through formal agreements with local school districts or the State Department of Education. In spite of such formal agreements, IHE faculty most commonly engage in induction program activities on an overload basis, though many faculty receive some reduction of load in other areas. Faculty interest appears to be the most common basis for assignment of faculty to induction activities.

IHE Involvement in Teacher Induction

The proposals offered below are based on several assumptions. First, that the initial years of teaching are a special time unlike any other phase in a teacher's career development, and that beginning teachers need thoughtfully planned and well-executed induction programs. Institutions of higher education must recognize that they have a responsibility to contribute to the effort to induct beginning teachers, and they they share this responsibility with a variety of other groups and agencies. It is also assumed that each of these agencies and groups are better suited to accomplish specific induction program goals than are other groups or agencies. Finally, the following proposals are based on the position that the most effective involvement of IHE faculty will be at the level in which one faculty member provides service to a group, rather than in a one-to-one arrangement.

Within the broad goal of orientation IHE faculty can make significant contributions. Higher education faculty should cooperatively design orientation programs and activities with local school districts or state departments of education. Teacher-education faculty can employ their training skills to prepare groups of community volunteers who will work with incoming teachers. Liberal arts faculty from disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, geography, history, economics, political science, linguistics, social work, and foreign languages can help plan orientation components by providing specific knowledge about school communities, local customs, neighborhood values, local history and community resources. These faculty can also provide training to new teachers in skills essential to cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity. Teacher-induction planners might look to similar training programs such as Vista and Peace Corps for how colleges and universities can serve as major resources.

Higher education faculty can be involved in both the planning and delivery of psychological support services for teacher-induction

programs. As a part of a school district's ongoing employee-assistance program, support groups could be offered to help new teachers cope with the effects of reality shock, stress in the workplace, or personal concerns related to teaching. Higher education counseling, psychology and social work faculty could be involved in direct group counseling with new teachers, or they could provide specific training or workshops for local school psychologists and counseling personnel who in turn would provide services to new teachers.

The goal of assisting new teachers in the acquisition and refinement of teaching skills provides many opportunities for higher education faculty involvement. As discussed, faculty may provide one-to-one individual attention to beginning teachers by engaging in field observations, supervision, and support team membership. The position taken here, however, is that such a level of involvement by IHE faculty is not the best use of the institutional resources, is not as likely as other forms of involvement to have a major impact on beginning teacher socialization, and is not well-suited to the present organizational structure of colleges and universities. It would be better for IHE faculty to involve themselves in induction programs at the level in which they work with groups. Such involvement may be in the form of seminars, classes, workshops or support groups just for new teachers. Given the current knowledge base about the problems and needs of beginning teachers, it is possible to tailor the content of such groups to meet the needs of the greatest number of beginning teachers. For example, the first four or five weeks of the school year would be an excellent time to offer workshops designed to provide assistance with evaluating student progress for report cards, or workshops on parent-teacher conferencing.

Because the new teacher's colleagues are powerful socializing forces (Zeichner, 1983), IHE faculty should consider how they can work with local school personnel to affect positive induction outcomes. As Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) notes, the use of mentor teachers represents an important induction strategy. IHE faculty can be involved in the identification and training of local school personnel to serve as mentors for new teachers. Similarly, IHE personnel can be involved in the development of local and state guidelines for mentoring programs (Wisniewski, Cobb, Edwards, Hovater, James, Pike & Talbert, 1985).

Finally, IHE faculty can be involved in the design and execution of local and state-wide evaluations of teacher-induction efforts. Guidance of this sort is essential if the profession is to build a firm

base upon which to extend knowledge and understanding of the induction process. Teacher educators are familiar with the questions which need to be asked and have the skills and knowledge necessary to insure that valid and reliable data are gathered to answer those questions.

References

Fox, S. M. & Singletary, T. J. (1986). Deductions about supportive induction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 12-15.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 6-11.

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., O'Neal, S., Barnes, S. & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state mandated beginning teacher programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 16-21.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., Denemark, G. W. & Nash, R. J. (1976). *Educating a profession.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 2-5.

Jersild, A. T. (1966). Behold the beginner. *The real world of the beginning teacher: Report of the Nineteenth TEPS Conference.* New York: National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association.

Johnston, J. M. (1985). Teacher induction: Problems, roles and guidelines. In P. J. Burke and R. G. Heideman (Eds.), *Career-long teacher education* (pp. 194-222). Springfield, IL., Charles Thomas.

Johnston, J. M. & James, T. L. (1986, August). *Leadership and cooperation through mentoring: Rethinking roles in teacher education.* Paper presented at the Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Flagstaff, AZ.

Lortie, D. C. (1966). Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe Model. *The real world of the beginning teacher: Report of the Nineteenth TEPS Conference.* New York: National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). The teaching internship and teacher induction. In C. C. Mackey, Jr. (Ed.), *Assuring qualified educational personnel in the eighties* (pp. 91-117). Proceedings of the annual convention of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (52nd), Boston, MA.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. *Journal of Teacher Education 37*(1), 26-29.

Ryan, K. (1970). *Don't smile until Christmas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, K., Newman, K., Mager, G., Applegate J., Lasley, T., Flora R., & Johnston, J. (1980). *Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers.* New York: Longman.

Schlecty, P. & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal, 83,* 469-487.

Varah, L. J., Theune, W. S., & Parker, L. (1986). Beginning teachers: Sink or swim? *Journal of Teacher Education 37*(1), 30-34.

Wisniewski, R., Cobb, J., Edwards, C., Hovater, A., James, T., Pike, M., Talbert, G. (1985). *Mentorship development.* Nashville, TN: Tennessee State Department of Education.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of teachers. In G. Griffin and H. Hukill (Eds.), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?* Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 240 109)

Zeichner, K. & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32,* 7-11.

Appendix A

Induction Activity Survey

1. Does your School, College or Department of Education (SCDE) currently have a program or activities designed to assist beginning teachers:

   (a) ___ in the planning stage (b) ___ in the pilot stage

   (c) ___ implemented (d) ___ No

   Comments:

2. If the answer to question 1 is **no**, does your SCDE have plans to initiate such activities in the next two years? ___ Yes ___ No

   Comments:

3. Below are a few examples of common beginning teacher induction activities. Please check those activities in which your SCDE is involved.

   ___ Offering course(s) primarily designed for beginning teachers

   ___ Field supervision of beginning teachers

   ___ Consulting with others about professional development activities for beginning teachers

   ___ Conducting workshops targeted for beginning teachers

   ___ Serve as members of beginning teacher support team

   ___ Internship/MAT/Alternative certification programs

4. If your SCDE is participating in beginning teacher support activities other than the examples listed in question 3, please list them below.

5. Are faculty other than SCDE faculty involved in induction activities?
   ___ Yes ___ No

   Comments:

6. Are your SCDE induction activities part of a formal agreement with local school systems? ___ Yes ___ No

   Comments:

7. How does your institution account for induction activities in faculty work load?

8. On what basis are faculty assigned to participation in induction activities?

Name of Person completing form _____

Address _____

_____

_____

For return mail: Please refold so business reply postage is visible, then tape closed.

V

Professional Organizations and Teacher Induction: Initiatives and Positions

Peggy Ishler
Bowling Green State University
and Ralph Kester
Seattle Pacific University

Historical Perspective

"Induction programs are a wise investment and provide the beginner with a feeling of security and the opportunity to grow" (Swanson, 1968). This statement concludes the 1968 report of the National Association of Secondary School Principals on its three year, experimental demonstration project for the induction of beginning teachers. As Warren Seypert, editor of the NASSP *Bulletin* indicated in the introduction to a summary article on the project (Hunt, 1968), the NASSP induction project was unusual in that it was conducted by a professional organization which had actually begun to influence practice in the schools.

A survey of ten leading professional organizations' positions on induction revealed that this 1968 NASSP project was the only major thrust among those professional organizations to study induction programs from that date until 1985. In that year the Association of Teacher Educators created a national commission to explore current induction practices.

Between 1969 and the mid-1980's it appears from surveying resolution statements and materials gathered from ten professional

organizations that induction has not been an action topic for teacher organizations, with the exception of the American Federation of Teachers. The AFT issued a number of resolution statements during those years on the need for and characteristics of induction programs. With these exceptions—the project and report by the NASSP in the sixties to emphasize the need for induction programs and the resolutions of the AFT during the seventies and eighties—induction was a neglected issue. This is surprising because articles and research studies appearing during that period had shown the first year of teaching to be a critical time (Ryan, 1974, 1979; Fuller & Bown, 1975).

However, the induction year came back into focus when *A Nation at Risk* and other key national studies from 1983 and 1984 called attention to teachers' needs and the necessity for reform of teacher education. These national reports did not directly address the induction period but did call for differentiating levels of teacher role classifications according to service and professional development. Such differentiation distinguished beginning teachers from experienced teachers and master teachers in terms of characteristics and needs. As states began to implement career ladder plans, the differing needs of beginning teachers were addressed in mandatory state-wide induction programs such as those in Florida, Oklahoma, and South Carolina, that called national attention to the importance of the induction phase into the profession.

As induction activity was spurred by state-mandated programs, professional organizations disseminated articles on induction in their publications. The journals of American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and Phi Delta Kappa published numerous articles on induction. The *Journal of Teacher Education* dedicated an issue to teacher induction in January/February 1986, Kappa Delta Pi dedicated a special issue of *The Record* (July/August, 1986) to the first year of teaching, *Phi Delta Kappan* published a Fastback on the *Induction of New Teachers* (Ryan, 1986) and Association of Teacher Educators' had an issue on Recruitment and Induction in *Action in Teacher Education* (Winter 1987). The Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development's journal, *Education Leadership*, also has carried articles on induction during the past several years. However, induction as a descriptor word was not added to the subject listing for ERIC until 1986, suggesting that relatively few papers on that topic had been received.

The role of professional organizations has not been a proactive one in promoting induction activities. As stated previously, the exception appears to be the AFT with its numerous resolutions

and considerable promotion of its model program—the Toledo Intern and Intervention Program started in 1984 (Toledo, 1985). The Toledo program is an induction program as well as remediation program for marginal teachers. Experienced teachers are released full-time from their teaching duties to provide support and professional development to beginning teachers.

Why induction slipped so low on the concerns list of professional organizations (with the above noted exceptions) remains a puzzle considering that Hunt (1968) pointed out nineteen years ago that "no other important profession is so careless about the induction of the new members. In most professions there is a carefully defined procedure used to bring new members along—to induct them.... Teaching is the only major profession in which the beginner is given full and immediate responsibility—the same or more difficult assignment than the experienced worker has...."

Today, induction is an important issue not only for the AFT but also for a number of other professional organizations. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (1984) has conducted a nationwide survey of the states' involvement in induction programs as to the states' responsibilities and their levels of support. American Association of School Personnel Administrators presently is conducting a national research project on induction. The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education has included a recommendation for completion of an induction period in their Commission for Excellence Report, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* (1985).

In 1985, the Association of Teacher Educators formed a commission to study induction; the Commission established links with the former Research and Development Center at the University of Texas, Austin, to engage in a national research project on induction programs and to produce a directory of induction programs around the country. The Commission also surveyed the state of the art of induction programs. The findings from these studies are reported in this monograph.

Now that the implementation of induction programs has become an action item in the national reform movement, what are the professional organizations recommending for induction programs? Following is a synopsis of resolutions and reports on induction issues over the past ten years from these organizations: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE); American Association of School Personnel Administrators (AASPA); American Federation of Teachers (AFT); Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD); Association of

Teacher Educators (ATE); National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC); National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP); National Education Association (NEA); National School Boards Association (NSBA); and Phi Delta Kappa (PDK). Other associations which were contacted include the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Association for School, College, and University Staffing, Inc. (ASCUS).

Induction Issues and Professional Organizations' Recommendations

1. Classification and Certification of Beginning Teachers
   a. endorse efforts of states and school districts to develop systems that recognize differences between an inductee or entry-year teacher and a senior professional—AACTE (1986)
   b. promote certification levels linked with continued professional development and evaluation—AACTE (1986)
   c. provide induction for at least one year following the awarding of a provisional certificate—AACTE (1985)
   d. establish internships lasting one to three years to precede certification and to be evaluated as part of a national teachers' exam which rates how well interns work with students and colleagues at the conclusion of the internship period—AFT (1975, 1982, 1985)
   e. grant preparatory certificate to an intern for a probationary period of two years at the conclusion of which a permanent certificate would be granted to qualified teachers—AFT (1975)
2. Teaching Load and Compensation
   a. endorse interns receiving compensation—AACTE (1985) and AFT (1982)
   b. support reduced teaching loads by at least one class period for beginning teachers—AACTE (1985), AFT (1982) and NASSP (1968)
3. Responsibility for Induction Programs
   a. recognize that internship involves schools, profession, and higher education working together to help new teachers—AACTE (1985)
   b. recognize that shared fiscal responsibility for induction program links local school systems, schools of education, and the state—AFT (1975)

c. recognize that professional development is a product of collaboration of higher education, schools, teachers, and local communities—AACTE (1975)

4. Trainers and/or Support Teachers for Beginning Teachers
   a. need involvement of experienced, high-quality teachers in supervising new teachers in probationary year—NSBA (1985)
   b. need to identify experienced, high-quality teachers to serve as cooperating teachers—NASSP (1968)
   c. need expanded opportunities for teachers to help new teachers, to implement staff development, and to create patterns of collegiality that insure ongoing professional renewal —AFT (1984)
5. Support for Trainer Teachers
   a. recognize that regular teachers with whom interns work must be given sufficient time and support to work with those under their supervision—AFT (1975)
   b. recognize teachers who train newcomers by offering employment status and rank on faculties of institutions of higher education—AFT (1975)
   c. enable experienced teachers involved in internship programs to work along with researchers in higher education to conduct research on teaching effectiveness—AFT (1975)
   d. establish the support of the principal for the entry program as essential—NASSP (1968)
6. Preparation of Trainer or Support Teachers
   a. recognize that colleges and universities should be concerned with the preparation of supervisory personnel and experienced classroom teachers who work with interns—AFT (1975)
7. Role of Intern in a Formalized Internship Period
   a. recognize that internship be used solely for development of professional expertise, not as a means of supplementing or reducing staff or budget—NEA (1977 & 1986)
8. Delineation of Support Functions from Administrative Functions
   a. recognize that the beginning teacher program must be clearly separated from administrative functions including evaluation—AFT (1984)
   b. maintain that experienced cooperating teachers should

not evaluate—NASSP (1969)

9. Nature of Induction Program
   a. develop carefully planned and supervised internship program that includes frequent consultation, feedback, supportive environment for ongoing inservice training and professional development—AFT (1982)
   b. provide aid in planning, aid in discipline matters, help in classroom control, knowledge of school policies, and insights into finding and using instructional materials—NASSP (1968)
   c. include information on the character of the community, student body, and school policies—NASSP (1968)
   d. provide courses taught by experienced classroom teachers as well as theorists and researchers from higher education— AFT (1985)

In Summary:

For fifteen years there was minimal leadership from professional organizations on the induction issue, with the AFT playing a role in keeping the issue in front of its membership through resolutions and papers. Today, AACTE and ATE as well as AFT have articulated positions on induction.

From those who have voiced positions, there appears to be unanimity regarding various issues. Beginning teachers are recognized as having different needs from experienced teachers, and, consequently, requiring special support. This support should come from experienced teachers with the cooperation of institutions of higher education and the state department of education. Certification should be linked to the completion of an entry year program. Teaching loads for beginners should be reduced. Support teachers need administrative backing for release time and training. In addition, organizations acknowledge that professional development needs to be separate from evaluation. Judging from the interest expressed by ATE teacher educators on induction findings, there appears to be a need for guidelines and models. As the induction movement gains momentum throughout the country and elsewhere, more professional organizations will promote the need for special programs to help facilitate the entry period into the profession.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Commission for Excellence (1985). *A call for change in teacher education.* Washington D.C.

American Association Colleges of Teacher Education (1980-86). Resolutions. Association Document.

American Federation of Teachers (1971-1986). *Educational issues: AFT policy resolutions.* Association Document.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1984). *Synthesis of ASCD resolutions through 1984.* Alexandria, VA.

Brooks, D.M. (Ed) (1986, July/August) Teaching: The first year. *The Record.* Kappa Delta Pi.

Fuller, F. F. & Bown, O.H. (1975). *Becoming a teacher.* (Report No. 2327). Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hunt, D. (1968). Teacher induction: An opportunity and a responsibilty. The beginning teacher. *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52*(330), 130-135.

Lasley, T. (Ed.) (1985). Policies, practices, research: A look at the future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(1), 37-46.

Lasley, T. (Ed.) (1986). Teacher induction—programs and research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 2-41.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985). *How to start the school year: Motivation, enthusiasm are keys to success.* Reston, VA.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (1984) Support systems for beginning teachers. *The NASDTEC Manual.*

National Education Association (1969-1986). *Resolutions adopted by the NEA representative assembly.* Washington D.C.

National School Boards Association (1985). *Resolutions, beliefs & policies, constitution & by laws.* Association Document.

Rauth, M. (February, 1982). *Professional practice: Present and future.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Houston, Texas.

Ryan, K. (1974). *Survival is not good enough: Overcoming the problems of beginning teachers.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Ryan, K. (1979). Toward understanding the problems: At the threshold of the profession. In K. Howey and R. Bents (Eds.). *Toward meeting the needs of beginning teachers.* Minneapolis, MN: U.S. Department of Education/Teacher Corps.

Ryan, K. (1986). *The induction of new teachers.* Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Fastback #237.

Seyfert, W. (Ed.) (1968). The beginning teacher. *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52*(330).

Shanker, A. (April, 1985). Remarks made before Representative Assembly of the New York State United Teachers, Niagara Falls, New York.

Swanson, P. (1968). A time to teach—and a time to learn. The beginning teacher. *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52*(330), pp. 74-84.

VI

Teacher Induction: Rationale and Issues

Sandra J. Odell
University of New Mexico

The 1980's have been marked by the publication of numerous commission reports that have expressed major concerns about the quality of education in our nation (Earley, 1984). These concerns have provided an essential impetus to educators and others to improve teaching in our public schools. One widely agreed upon improvement is the development of teacher induction programs at both local and statewide levels. Although the specifics of teacher induction programs vary, a common goal is to provide a structured and supportive entry into the teaching profession for beginning teachers. This section presents the educational rationale for teacher induction programs and issues that arise in their development. Special consideration is given to the concerns of beginning teachers and to the structural, personnel and pedagogical characteristics of teacher induction programs.

Rationale

The professional and personal concerns of beginning teachers are unique. Accordingly, the rationale underlying teacher-induction programs is that the development of beginning teachers can be enhanced if they are given support to address these concerns during their transition from student teacher to instructional leader in the classroom.

Beginning Teacher Concerns

Many authors (e.g. Hawk, 1984; Lortie, 1975; Veenman, 1984) have concluded that serious problems of professional and personal

adjustment are incurred by those entering the teaching profession. Consider, for example, the anxieties faced by beginning teachers who are given the same or more difficult classroom responsibilities than are veteran teachers and who, quite naturally, fear that they will be viewed as incompetent when compared to more experienced teachers (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985).

No matter how excellent the new teacher's training, no training simulation accurately represents the reality of full-time teaching. Classroom responsibilities no longer rest with the cooperating teachers as in student teaching. Suddenly, the enormity of the job hits the first-year teacher. Among the professional questions that demand almost simultaneous answers by new teachers are: How do I control kids who don't behave? How do I motivate students who seem disinterested? How do I deal with individual student differences? How do I assess student progress? How do I keep records and make reports to parents?

As if adjustment to their professional roles is not difficult enough, first-year teachers face a variety of personal concerns (McDonald and Elias, 1983; Ryan, et al., 1980). They are often criticized for their ideas, which some veteran teachers consider as too naive or idealistic. Resultant feelings of isolation and inadequacy may be compounded by impatient families and non-teaching friends who question why teaching takes so much preparation and time outside the classroom. Further, new teachers enter a world of adult financial and nonstudent responsibilities that are in stark contrast to the security and regularity of university campus and student life from which they come.

Beginning teachers encountering these realities may experience a collapse of the ideals they formed about teaching during teacher training and leave the profession before they learn to cope with the day-to-day stresses all teachers inevitably and continually face (Veenman, 1984). It is a striking commentary to realize that 15 percent of new teachers leave the profession after the first year (Schlechty and Vance, 1983). It has been argued that teacher-induction programs have the potential of increasing the retention rate of promising teachers (Huling-Austin, 1986). Although this is a desirable by-product of teacher induction, it is likely to come to fruition only if accompanied by other changes such as higher salaries, higher status, improved working conditions, and opportunities for professional advancement.

It seems evident, then, that the general goal of teacher induction is to offer interventions that orient new teachers to the school and community, and that provide instructional and interpersonal

support which fosters professional development and retention as a teacher. The specific nature of these interventions is best derived from an understanding of the stages of teacher development.

Stages of Teacher Development

Beginning teachers usually progress through a series of stages before emerging as truly competent instructional leaders (Burke, Fessler, and Christensen, 1984; Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1972). Accordingly, well-designed induction interventions should accelerate the developmental process so as to minimize the duration of those early developmental stages which antedate subsequent stages of higher teaching competency.

Teacher development theories have tended to emphasize either levels of cognitive development or stages of teacher concerns. Cognitive development theory postulates that there is a progression in the new teacher's level of conceptual development from stages marked by simplistic and noncreative thinking to advanced stages of analytic and flexible thinking (Glassberg, 1979). One implication of this is that advanced teachers will be more effective because they are more capable of using a wide range of teaching strategies than are less developed teachers.

Stages of teacher concerns theory postulates that the concerns of new teachers are uniquely different from those of advanced teachers, and that teaching efficacy will be enhanced by a progression through the stages of teacher concerns (Glassberg, 1979). Once again, teacher induction interventions should facilitate this stage progression by offering support that satisfies the concerns of new teachers and thereby fosters their adoption of more advanced and efficacious teacher concerns.

Beginning teachers seem most concerned about personally surviving from day to day. It is not atypical for the first-year teacher to ask "Does it get better?" or "Will I make it to the end of the week?" or "How do I do a good job and still have a life outside of teaching?" (Odell and Loughlin, 1986). Scheduling and organizing the day, functioning within the school system, classroom discipline, and finding teaching resources and materials are other important new teacher concerns (Veenman, 1984). In contrast, advanced teachers are characterized by concerns about the impact their instruction has on students, about collaborating with other professionals, and about teaching as a profession.

Concerns of beginning teachers should be used to identify the types of support offered in an induction program. A truly reactive induction support program would track the changing concerns of

new teachers continuously over time and appropriately adjust the nature of the support offered in an attempt to encourage teaching expertise (Odell, 1986b).

Teaching expertise is sometimes characterized in terms of the technical and managerial aspects of teaching. To have the achievement of these characteristics as the sole endpoint of a teacher induction program seems to underutilize the potential of induction programs. Given requisite entering competencies on the part of new teachers, and given support teachers who are well trained in the techniques of supportive supervision, it seems possible for induction programs to foster better teaching strategies and to help teachers reach beyond the technical and managerial aspects of teaching so as to study teaching by analysis and reflection.

In summary, the role of the beginning teacher is onerous, and the cognitive competencies and professional and personal concerns of new teachers often affect their teaching efficacy. The overall goal of teacher induction programs is to provide structured support which will help socialize and nurture the new teacher, and which will help the teacher to develop progressively to stages of higher teacher competence. The goal seems sound enough, but it leaves unanswered how best to implement and design an induction program. Indeed, several issues regarding the design of induction programs have emerged and deserve further consideration.

Issues

As in the development of any educational program, the development of teacher induction programs gives rise to several issues about formal program structure, personnel, and pedagogical content. Within each of these categories several interrelated factors merit consideration before a fully functional program can emerge.

Structural Considerations

An issue concerning the formal structure of teacher-induction programs is which educational agency is responsible for program initiation and implementation. To date, some induction programs have been implemented statewide by mandates of legislatures and state departments or boards of education (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes, & Paulissen, 1986). Other induction programs have been initiated by local school districts (Brooks and Hirsh, 1985), while still others have been started by colleges of education (Odell, 1986a). As might be expected, program characteristics are highly correlated with the initiating agency, since each has a

unique contribution to make, and each has a vested interest to protect.

State departments of education are responsible for assuring that teachers in their states are competent and licensed. Thus, state-mandated teacher induction programs are often part of a licensure process where the induction period is viewed as a probationary time during which the performance of new teachers can be assessed. As a result, a major characteristic of most state mandated teacher induction programs is that they are biased toward the evaluation of new teachers and serve to screen out the least promising teachers. The goal of teacher induction can be somewhat compromised, however, if technical aspects of applying the licensure criteria take precedence over the support component of the induction program.

Local school districts are also concerned with the competency of new teachers. Being the immediate employers of new teachers, however, they often initiate programs that primarily orient the teachers to the school's procedures and environment (Brooks and Hirsh, 1985; Johnston, 1985). Where orientation becomes the singular focus of induction programs, they tend to be quite short in duration and to rely on the informal involvement of veteran teachers within the school. Such programs usually do not have a formal evaluation component, but they do have potential for involving the veteran teachers in offering structured instructional support to new teachers.

Teacher induction programs initiated by colleges of education generally are not linked to licensure and, thus, are not strongly evaluative. They also are not the employers of new teachers and, thus, are not singularly orientational (Odell, 1986a). Instead, college based programs tend to focus on educating beginning teachers through formal or informal coursework.

No matter which agency initiates the program, it is desirable for state boards of education, local school districts and colleges of education to cooperate in the endeavor so that any resultant teacher induction program will offer integrated support involving evaluation, orientation and developmental components.

Personnel Considerations

As teacher induction programs are designed, a cast of characters emerges. First, new teachers who are to be the recipients of the induction support must be identified. In some programs this includes only those individuals who are brand new to the teaching profession. In other programs, experienced teachers who are

working for the first time in the particular school system are also included. The objective here is to provide new system teachers with an orientation to the school and community. Still other programs include experienced teachers who are changing certification areas, such as an elementary teacher who is initiating a transition to special education. The induction objective here is not so much to socialize the individual into the teaching profession, or to orient the teacher to the system, but to provide instructional support in the new specialty area.

When several categories of new teachers are included in the same program, it needs to be decided whether all should receive the same support in regard to program content, program duration and degree of support or supervision. On the surface it seems likely that experienced teachers new to the system would need less instructional and emotional support, over a shorter period of time, than would new to the profession teachers. This was confirmed in an empirical study that compared these two categories of new teachers (Odell, 1986b). However, this study also showed that all teachers whose teaching situations are new can benefit from induction support.

The second type of personnel consideration in designing teacher induction programs involves identifying the individuals who will actually deliver the support services to new teachers. These people are typically veteran teachers and usually are referred to as support or mentor teachers. Veteran support teachers should possess high levels of teaching competency and be capable of sharing this competency with new teachers.

The responsibility of selecting support personnel often falls to local school district administrators. This engenders two related problems pertaining to the identification of effective teachers. First, the judgments of some administrators, particularly principals, may be unreliable in identifying effective teachers (Rauth, 1986). Second, support or mentor teachers chosen solely by school administrators may not receive the endorsement of their peer veteran teachers as being uniquely qualified to help beginning teachers. One way around this latter egalitarian attitude among veteran teachers is to involve them in the process of selecting the support or mentor teachers. Doing so has the added advantage of enhancing the professional stature of teachers by involving them as educational decision makers. Where a teacher induction program is a collaborative effort that involves a college of education and local school administrators, veteran teachers should be joined by a college representative in the selection process.

As an aside, the title given to the veteran teachers in teacher-induction programs can make a difference. Assigning the title "master teacher" tends to be divisive since it implies superiority to other veteran teachers. The title of "mentor teacher" is properly reserved for when a new teacher selects a senior colleague to provide guidance and support (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986). Finally, the title "support teacher" best describes the function of these veteran teachers and seems to be the most value neutral.

Needless to say, for a support teacher to achieve credibility with new teachers, it is important that the support teacher have recent classroom experience at a comparable grade level. One selection criterion, then, is that the support teachers be drawn from the ranks of current excellent teachers. However, not all teachers who are excellent with their own students are necessarily excellent at supporting new teachers. In as much as the target population to be supported consists of adult teachers, support teachers should be chosen who have had successful working experiences with adults. Wagner (1985) has stressed the importance of support teachers being sensitive and responsive to the ideas of others. They also need to be receptive to learning new information about the process of teaching. Finally, an important criterion for selecting veteran teachers is their capacity for empathy and their ability to offer unconditional support to people experiencing the perils of beginning teaching.

Once support teachers have been selected, issues arise as to how much of a support teacher's time should be spent in assisting new teachers and how long a veteran teacher should serve in the support capacity. The first of these issues reduces fundamentally to the question of whether support teachers should be required to continue some or all of their responsibilities as classroom teachers or whether they should be released substantially or fully from teaching. Obviously, strong proponents of teacher induction programs favor full release time for support teachers so as to increase their contact time with beginning teachers.

The caveat to the full time release approach is that support teachers, who have been identified as excellent teachers, are removed from direct teaching of students. Students may be affected adversely. In addition, if veteran teachers remain in the support teacher role for long periods of time, they may take on the characteristics of mini-administrators. Thus, Rauth (1986) has emphasized the importance of rotating support teachers back into classroom teaching positions after no more than three years. When

support teachers do return to schools as regular members of a school staff, they should serve as a resource for other teachers on the staff by offering inservice workshops or other staff development activities.

Pedagogical Considerations

After structural and personnel issues have been resolved, attention can be focused on such program areas as identifying the role of the support teacher, determining the content of training for support teachers, and determining the content of support for beginning teachers. These areas all relate to the content, methodology, science and art of teaching. Accordingly, they have been grouped together as pedagogical considerations.

1. Identifying the Role of the Support Teacher: Assistance versus Assessment

As programs are designed to support new teachers, a key issue is whether support teachers will offer only assistance to beginning teachers or whether they will also assess or evaluate new-teacher performance. The advantage of having assistance separate from assessment is that it allows new teachers to confide in support teachers more easily than if the support teachers are evaluating their progress. First year teachers are often uncomfortable with those in evaluative positions and are reluctant to discuss their concerns, thereby denying themselves the assistance they need (Fox & Singletary, 1986). In a study by Huffman and Leak (1986) new teachers recognized the "beneficial feedback" they received from support teachers, who they viewed as "friendly critics" offering constructive criticism, so long as the support teachers were not in a formal evaluative role.

Despite the cautions against combining assistance and assessment, the attraction of using support teachers as part of the evaluative process is strong. Support teachers frequently have the best opportunity to observe beginning teachers as they assist them regularly in their classroom work. Thus, they may have the most extensive information about the performance and competency of new teachers.

The best solution to the assistance versus assessment issue is to consider the assessments of the support teachers only as confirmation or disconfirmation of evaluations made by a separate assessment process of which the support teachers are not a part. In this way the support teacher's input is retained, but the primary responsibility for assessment rests with others than those who are offering the support. A discrepancy between the assessments

resulting from the formal evaluation process and those of the support teachers should serve simply as the impetus for further study by the formal evaluation process.

2. Determining the Content of Training for Support Teachers

Since individuals who have been identified as excellent teachers of children or adolescents may not be able to transfer their skills directly in the assistance of new teachers, the issue of how to train support teachers in their new role emerges. A first concern is whether the support teacher is to be trained in an evaluative role, an assistance role, or both. In any case, it seems obvious from the above that support teachers should be exposed to the literature pertaining to teacher development, new teacher needs and concerns, effective teaching, supervision, induction, and adult professional development. Huffman and Leak (1986) further suggest that support teachers receive training in the areas of role clarification, observation and conducting conferences.

In addition to these formal content and skill areas, the support teacher should be given the opportunity to share ideas and pool resources, to problem solve, to use a case study approach, and to evaluate their own work.

A question that emerges in training support teachers is where and when they should receive this training. The options are few but diverse. Either teachers will be asked to acquire the requisite knowledge through self study or they will be provided formal, structured class work through inservice workshops or university courses. In either case the issue of whether support teachers should receive release time to accommodate to their training arises. Although release time will enhance the support teachers' opportunities to better learn their role of assisting new teachers, this can be done only at the cost of taking support teachers away from their primary function of assisting new teachers. Obviously, this represents a quality versus quantity trade off in the extremes, with the best approach lying somewhere toward the middle of the cost-effectiveness dimension.

3. Determining the Content of Support for Beginning Teachers

Little actual debate seems to exist over the support content for beginning teachers in teacher induction programs. Generally speaking, support is offered around their specific areas of concern. In a study by Odell (1986b) the support services actually offered to new teachers participating in a comprehensive induction program were recorded systematically over the course of one year. Results of this study showed that support content dealt primarily with information

about the school system, with obtaining resources and materials for teaching, and with information about teaching strategies and the instructional process.

While there is general agreement as to the content of support for new teachers, approaches to providing assistance differ, ranging from a rather direct, observation/feedback approach to a nondirective, laissez faire approach. At one extreme, the direct, observation/feedback approach is characterized by observing the new teacher, identifying obvious concerns, and then directly telling the new teacher how to resolve the concern. At the opposite end of the continuum, the nondirective, laissez faire approach is characterized by simply waiting for the new teacher to specify a concern.

In programs where support teachers are involved as evaluators for beginning teachers, the direct approach is prevalent. Assessing the performance of new teachers almost demands that specific concerns be identified in the context of direct observation and feedback sessions.

Within programs that emphasize assistance rather than assessment, there is more variability in approaches. Within such programs the direct and laissez faire approaches are blended. Allowing new teachers to identify concerns for themselves in response to support teacher questions gives the new teacher structure and encouragement to identify their concerns. By so doing, the support teacher can respond to areas of concern expressed by beginning teachers while also having a direct hand in assisting them in identifying these concerns.

Final Note

Although a number of issues have been identified which need to be resolved in developing a teacher induction program, the reader is urged not to be discouraged from developing and implementing an induction program *de novo*. What program evaluation data are available to date demonstrate clearly that teacher induction programs can be efficacious across a wide variety of program designs. To be sure, these data are not plentiful and too preliminary to demonstrate positive outcomes after long-term follow up. Induction programs are simply still too new to be a proven component of the life-long process of developing teachers. Nevertheless, the rationale for teacher induction programs is clear, and the needs of new teachers cannot be ignored. What remains is the need for analytical research on teacher induction to direct our future program designs, and for outcome research to tell us how better to induct teachers into the teaching profession.

References

Brooks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1985). *Programmatic teacher induction: Research results and program design.* Richardson, TX: Richardson Independent School District.

Burke, P.J., Fessler, R., & Christensen, J.C. (1984). *Teacher career stages: Implications for staff development.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Earley, P. (1984). A summary of eleven national reports on education and their implications for teacher education. Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Fox, S.M., & Singletary, T.J. (1986). Deductions about supportive induction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1) 12-15.

Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal, 6,* 207-226.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). *Mentoring: A review of the literaure with a focus on teaching.* Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37,* (1), 6-11.

Glassberg, S. (1979). A developmental model for the beginning teacher. In K.R. Howey & R.H. Bents (Eds.), *Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher* (pp. 111-139). Lansing, MI: Midwest Teacher Corps. Network. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 581).

Hawk, P. (1984). *Making a difference: Reflections and thoughts of first year teachers.* Greenville, North Carolina University.

Hoffman, J.V., Edwards, S.A., O'Neal, S. Barnes, S., & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 16-21.

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 22-25.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 2-5.

Johnston, J.M. (1985). Teacher induction: Problems, roles and guidelines. In P.J. Burke & R.G. Heideman (Eds.), *Career-long teacher education* (pp. 194-222). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Katz, L.G. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *Elementary School Journal, 73,* 50-54.

Lortie, D.D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McDonald, F.J., & Elias, P. (1983). *The transition into teaching: The problems of beginning teachers and programs to solve them. Summary report.* Berkeley, CA: Educational Testing Service.

Odell, S.J. (1986a). A model university-school system collaboration in teacher induction. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 22* (4), 120-121.

Odell, S.J. (1986b). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 26-29.

Odell, S.J., & Loughlin, C.L. (1986, February). *Innovative inservice in a collaborative internship/induction program.* Paper presented at the sixty-sixth annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Atlanta, GA.

Rauth, M., & Bowers, G.R. (1986). Reactions to induction articles. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (1), 38-41.

Ryan, D., Newman, K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lasley, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). *Biting the apple: Accounts of first year teachers.* New York: Longman.

Schlechty, P. (1985). A framework for evaluating induction into teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36* (1), 37-41.

Schlechty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *The Elementary School Journal, 83,* (4), 469-487.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54* (1), 143-178.

Wagner, L.A. (1985). Ambiguities and possibilities in California's mentor teacher program. *Educational Leadership, 43* (3), 23-29.

About the Authors

Douglas M. Brooks is Chair/Professor of the Department of Teacher Education at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. His research on teacher-student verbal and nonverbal behavior exchange and beginning teacher behavioral expression has appeared in *The Elementary School Journal, Journal of Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership* and *The Review of Research in Education.* He guest-edited the 1986 July/August issue of Kappa Delta Pi's *Record* entitled "Teaching: The First Year."

Parmalee P. Hawk is Coordinator of Field Services at East Carolina University. She has been involved with the development of teacher assessment instruments in several states and active in teacher induction for over 13 years. She was the recipient of the 1985 ATE Distinguished Research Award.

Leslie Huling-Austin is Associate Professor of Secondary Education at Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos. She was previously a program director at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin where she was principal investigator of the Model Teacher Induction Project study. While at R&DCTE, she also coordinated a national Teacher Induction Network and managed the Teacher Induction in Diverse Settings study, a national collaborative effort involving 26 institutions from across the United States.

Peggy Ishler is Director of Field Experiences and Standards Compliance at Bowling Green State University. She is the chair of the Induction Commission.

John M. Johnston is Associate Professor of Curriculum & Instruction at Memphis State University. He has served on numerous advisory boards and committees for state and national associations with interest in teacher education. He is engaged in scholarship on early childhood education and teacher induction. His publications include several book chapters and contributions to *Journal of Teacher Education* and *Action in Teacher Education.*

Richard S. Kay is Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, College of Education, Brigham Young University. He authors and presents on the topics of self-concept development and socialization in professional settings. His publications have appeared in

The Journal of Psychology, Action in Teacher Education and *The Journal of Teacher Education.*

Ralph J. Kester, Associate Dean of Continuing Education, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, Washington, teacher, professor and administrator in teacher education for 26 years.

Mary D. Marockie is Curriculum Research Coordinator at the Educational Service Center, Wheeling, West Virginia. She has experience at both college and school based levels and presently works with administrators in a regional institute format and serves as consultant to county systems on induction efforts. She is a member of the ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force addressing national reform issues.

Sandra J. Odell is Assistant Professor and Director, Elementary Teacher Induction, University of New Mexico. She researches the needs and concerns of new teachers in induction contexts. The program she directs was the recipient of the 1985 Distinguished Achievement Award of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Shirley N. Robards, Director of Field Experiences and Entry-Year Assistance at the University of Tulsa. She was a member of the A.T.E. Board of Directors from 1983-86. Presently Dr. Robards is serving as the Director and District III Representative on the Phi Delta Kappa International Board. She is also a 1986 District III nominee for Vice-President/President of PDK.